

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

WHOLE No. 689  
VOL. XXVIII, No. 8

December 9, 1922

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE .....	169-172
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Exaggerated Politeness to the Turks—The Value of Presumption—Traffic in Polish Souls—Luther and the Bible.....	173-179
COMMUNICATIONS .....	179-181
EDITORIALS	
Scrapping the Declaration of Independence—The School and the Citizen—Who Won the War?—Good Government and the Ku Klux Klan .....	182-184
DRAMATICS	
The Season's Plays—God's Ways—Reviews—Books and Authors.....	184-188
EDUCATION	
Religious Training in Schools.....	189-190
SOCIOLOGY	
A Page from the November Elections.....	190-191
NOTE AND COMMENT.....	191-192

## Chronicle

**Greece.**—The world was startled by the execution, on November 28, of five former Cabinet officers and one army official, condemned to death by shooting, on the charge of high treason in connection with the Greek military disaster in Asia Minor. The condemned men were Gounaris, Stratos, Protopapadakis, Baltazzis, Theotokis and General Hadjanestis. The first three mentioned were former Premiers, Theotokis had been War Minister and Baltazzis held portfolios in several Cabinets. General Hadjanestis was in command of the Greek forces during the late military defeat. General Stratigos and M. Goudas were sentenced to penal servitude for life. The military defendants were also sentenced to degradation and additional fines were inflicted, amounting in the case of Baltazzis and Theotokis to 1,000,000 drachmas each. The trial took place by court martial, and the reason officially given for the infliction of death penalty is in effect that the condemned knowingly concealed from the people the danger involved in the return of King Constantine to the throne. Although they knew, it is said, that Greece was breaking away from her alliances, they did their utmost to consolidate Constantine's throne in order to enjoy office under him. The statement of the court then continues:

By terroristic methods they stifled all public opinion contrary to them, arranged with General Hadjanestis a pretended offensive against Constantinople, and thereby brought about the enemy's offensive and the collapse of the Greek front in Asia Minor, thus deliberately delivering a large part of the army into the enemy's hands. They, therefore, were convicted, in accordance with several articles of the military and penal codes, of conspiring to commit high treason.

In addition to this the Greek Government itself issued a declaration of policies in which it expressed itself as fully aware of the difficulties of the present situation and promised to do all in its power to secure the rights of Greece, the organization of the army, the purification and reconstruction of the public service, the prevention of illicit speculation and the protection of the workers' legitimate interests.

With the single exception of the former Minister of National Economy, M. Rouffos, the entire Cabinet organized by Protopapadakis on May 21 last has thus been put to death. It was a small coalition Ministry of six men, formed after Gounaris and Baltazzis had returned to Athens after a journey vainly made to the various Entente Chancelleries asking for help against the Turk, or begging that at least France and Italy might not supply him with arms. Gounaris and Stratos had successively held the premiership, the latter for a brief space. Then both united to form with Protopapadakis the coalition Ministry which held office until the revolution. The revolutionists are said to have mainly been army men who suffered by the restoration of Constantine. The National Assembly was ignored by them and a special committee of inquiry organized, known as the Revolutionary Committee. On its report a court martial was ordered and a number of Generals and former Ministers were placed under arrest. An indictment for high treason followed on November 13, the accused men being permitted to testify in their own defense. Great Britain at once made serious representations against the death penalty, when the infliction of this seemed probable, but her intervention was ignored by the Revolutionary Committee. Immediately therefore upon the executions the British Minister, F. G. Lindley, notified the Greek Government that Great Britain had broken off relations with Greece. In the opinion of diplomats the action taken by the Revolutionary Committee will cost Greece dearly.

All responsibility was placed upon the shoulders of the Ministry and not upon King Constantine, who was per-

sonally held to be blameless by the Committee. In the meantime the present King George has been confined as a prisoner in his palace and is permitted to see no persons except those possessing the confidence of the Cabinet. The strenuous effort made on his part to save the sentenced men led to a conflict between him and the Gonatas Government, whose Ministry was sworn in on November 28, following the resignation of the Crokidas Cabinet. King George is said to have even requested the Ministers of Rumania and Jugoslavia to save the condemned prisoners. Following the executions he informed the new Cabinet that he desired to leave the country, but the Government not merely refused its consent, but took measures to prevent him from leaving even his palace.

On November 30, a statement was issued that General Dousmanis, former Chief of the General Staff, and General Valettas, former Chief of Staff in Asia Minor, had been arrested. A warrant had also been issued for the arrest of General Papoulas, former Commander-in-Chief of the army in Asia Minor. The statement then added the information that: "The trial of Prince Andrew (brother of former King Constantine), who commanded an army corps at the time of the Sakarta operations, begins next week." The trial opened in fact on December 2. It was the first instance of a member of the royal family being brought before a court martial. The Prince was charged with contributing to the Greek defeat in Asia Minor by ignoring orders sent to him on the battlefield by the General Staff. The court before which he appeared was composed of ten officers and the trial was purely of a military character. The fact that its opening was advanced two days caused grave anxiety abroad, as it was feared that the authorities wished to have judgment rendered before outside influences could be brought to interfere. The trial now proceeded without delay, but the Prince was saved a severer penalty than banishment for life and deprivation of rank on the score of his inexperience in commanding large masses of troops and the difficulties of the position in which he was placed. The court, however, declared him guilty of refusing to obey orders in the presence of the enemy. He will not suffer degradation, as at first reported.

**Lausanne Conference.**—Turks and Russians, while successfully cowing the Allied statesmen at almost every turn, have sought to create the impression at Lausanne of a possible accord of America with their own attitude upon important questions, such as the open-door policy, by which Turkey seeks relief from the claims of special privilege on the part of the Allies. On this and other points she has the strong support of Russia, and both countries desire to utilize to the utmost what may seem to be a fundamental difference between the Allies and Washington. No encouragement has been given to any of these efforts by Ambassador Childs. Ismet Pasha, however,

is plain-spoken in his desire to make a general treaty with the United States and to begin negotiations at any time. While the exclusion of Russia from the conference proper has caused considerable turmoil, the central topic of discussion on November 28 was the Mosul question. It is at Mosul that important oil fields are situated. Hence the firm refusal of England, who holds the mandate of Mesopotamia, to allow the Turkish frontiers to include this area. Turkey on the other hand is actually in a position to throw into this district immensely larger forces of troops than the British now have in that vicinity. She vigorously denies that England has any right over Mosul in as far as the Sèvres Treaty was never ratified, while the Mudros armistice was made with the Sultanic Government and is not binding upon Angora. Therefore the Turks hold that England has no claim to Mesopotamia except such as the present conference, in agreement with Angora, may concede. Russia sustains the Turkish position that the Allies are not entitled to decide among themselves as to the disposition of the territory which was formerly part of the Ottoman Empire.

It is all a question of oil. Throughout the controversy France, on whose support the Turks had evidently counted, stood firmly by England. "What England has given to France for Allied unity is not clear," the *New York Times* correspondent remarks in his special cable dispatch. "One surmise is that it is a promise of passivity on the Rhine in case of French direct action against Germany." The Turks desire to take over Mosul that they may sell the oil concessions to the highest bidder and participate in the revenues from their exploitation.

On the issue of the Ottoman debt the Turks pleaded to be held responsible for only part of it. They demanded that the territories which have been cut from the former Empire must bear their own share, since the Kemalists had built a new State on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire.

By November 29 the correspondent just quoted was forced to report that in ten days the Conference had reached no satisfactory settlement of any question, and that the general atmosphere was much worse than on the opening day. Both Allies and Turks regarded themselves as the victors, and no side would submit to dictation from the other.

On the same day the darkness of this shadow was deepened by the continued deadlock over the possession of the Mosul oil fields, the English refusing to give them up and the Turks insisting on having them. The former friendship of the Turks for the French, who had aided them in their success against the Greeks, turned into bitter hatred upon this point, so much so that Edwin L. James in reporting this fact spoke of it as one of the most important developments of the Lausanne Conference.

Not only have the French lost their favored position with the

#### *Fate of the Kings*

#### *Turkish and Russian Problems*

#### *The Shadow Deepens*



Turks but Ismet Pasha and his colleagues are much more bitter now against the French than against the British. They have always regarded the British as enemies and British opposition causes no surprise; but they came to Lausanne with the idea that the French were their friends and supporters with their hands free from Allied entanglements. Finding the French and British united, the Turks make charges of treason and say that if they had known what conditions would prevail here they would not have signed the Mudania armistice.

At this point, America, too, entered indirectly into the controversy by announcing her interests in the oil fields through the statement given to the Associated Press by Ambassador Childs, the chief spokesman for the United States at Lausanne.

He explained that America was simply holding to the view that she must have equal rights with the other Powers to participate in the oil development, regardless of whether the oil fields were transferred from mandated territories to declared Turkish territory or remained under mandated control.

The United States, in other words, insists that the juggling of boundaries, through the medium of the Lausanne Conference or any other conference, shall not impair the rights Americans now have or may acquire.

If Turkey is successful in her claim to ownership of that part of Mesopotamia containing the Mosul oil fields, America will insist that the rights of her citizen be respected there, just as she will insist if England maintains her mandatory control over the Mosul district.

These discussions found their echo in the charges brought against our State Department at home by Henry Morgenthau, to the effect that a representative of the Standard Oil Company had demanded from the Dutch Shell Company of England certain of their oil interests in Turkish territory, and that a quarter of these interests were actually handed over to him when he made good his claim that he was backed by the American State Department. The State Department has answered this charge and Mr. Morgenthau has in turn reiterated it, stating that these are the essential facts. The State Department holds that the only action that could be referred to was its "mandate note asking for equal opportunity for American enterprise in mandate territory."

November 30 was the day when the Russians occupied the center of the scene. They were to be heard on questions pertaining to the Straits, but to be excluded from other discussion. This condition they would not accept until they could consult with their chairman, Tchitcherin, who was then absent. The Russians in the meantime are very outspoken in favoring the Turks against the English. The exclusion from the Straits of all warships but Turkish, was given out by Tchitcherin, before leaving for Lausanne, as the only solution of the Near East question. "Any other peace," he is reported by the *Chicago Tribune* Company to have said, "will be overthrown by the Turks themselves with full support of Russia." These are strong words and show clearly what the attitude of Russia will be as against Great Britain and France. Here, too,

these two nations are united on the British program of demilitarization of the Straits, to be carried out under the control of the League of Nations or some other international commission, with full freedom of passage for ships of commerce and war of all nations. The Turks, however, were not prepared to accept all the Russian proposals. The issue of the Straits is not of prime importance to them and they are willing to submit to their demilitarization in spite of the Russian demand that the Turks fortify them. They are even willing to admit the entrance of one warship at a time, provided Constantinople is sufficiently protected. In a word, they will not accept dictation even from Russia, neither will they meet the terms of the Allies.

Reports differ as to the events that took place on December 1. According to the correspondent of the *New York Times*, Ismet Pasha faced the Allied statesmen and point-

**Banishment of** edly insisted on the banishment of the 1,000,000 Greeks who still remain in **Greeks from Turkey** Turkish territory, after another million had already succumbed to Turkish cruelty, or in the words of Lord Curzon, "have been killed, deported or have died." According to another version, ascribed to "American circles," the "orders" were merely permissions for the Greeks to leave if they so wish. Everyone, however, understands that the Greeks had better accept the invitation to leave even though not technically banished. To indicate what is really at stake, Lord Curzon gave the following statistics regarding Anatolia alone:

He said that figures from American sources showed that before 1914, there were 1,600,000 Greeks in Anatolia. Between 1914 and 1918, 300,000 died, left the country or otherwise disappeared. Between 1919 and 1922, another 200,000 left Anatolia or disappeared. In September and October of this year, another reduction of 500,000 took place, leaving now 500,000 or 600,000 Greeks in Anatolia, most of whom were males between 15 and 60, to whom the Turks had refused permission to leave.

Lord Curzon added that there had been 300,000 Greeks in Constantinople, most of whom are still there. But of the 320,000 Greeks in Eastern Thrace, some of whose families had been in that country a thousand years or more, all had fled in dread of the Turk. The proposal to trade the 300,000 Greeks in Constantinople for the 120,000 Turks in Western Thrace was taken under official consideration, the statesmen "playing" with the homes and existence of hundreds of thousands of human beings.

The question of capitulations was taken up on December 2 and like all the other questions, with one small exception in which no private interests were crossed, left the conference hopelessly divided. The Turks simply asserted their full right to abrogate the capitulations and definitely declared they would give no guarantees "incompatible with Turkish sovereignty." It was in vain that M. Barrère insisted that the capitulations represented treaty rights and could not be abrogated at pleasure with-

out the consent of all parties concerned. If the capitulations were to be abolished then new guarantees must be given to foreigners. Ambassador Childs read the following statement:

The position of the United States is exactly that stated by the Allied Powers in regard to rights arising out of the capitulations. The United States has not and does not now recognize the attempted abrogation of these rights. This delegation, however, believes there is in this whole subject an interest common to all concerned, and that the sooner it is explored the better.

To all arguments, Ismet replied that the capitulations were unnecessary, that they belonged to the Middle Ages, and that Turkey could give sufficient protection to foreigners by her own laws.

**Italy.**—On November 25 the Chamber of Deputies, by an overwhelming vote of 275 against 90, accorded to the Mussolini Government full power to adopt any measures

#### *Mussolini Assumes*

#### *Full Power*

it thinks best within the entire range of bureaucratic and fiscal reform. The Fascisti leader will thus be able to proceed with any measures which he and his Cabinet consider desirable, unhampered by parliamentary considerations. "We ask for full power," Mussolini told the Parliament, "because we wish to assume full responsibility for all our actions." According to a wireless to the *New York Times*, the power thus held was made valid, by the resolution of the Chamber, until December 31, 1923, the Government binding itself in turn to give a full report by March, 1923, of the use made of this power.

The financial policies to be pursued by the new Government were outlined by Alberto de Stefani, Mussolini's Minister of Finance. All laws tending to penalize capital, that were passed by former Cabinets, will be abandoned. "To bind financial policy with such ideas would be madness." Taxes which are so high as to dry up production are to be reduced, while the hand of the Government is to prevent the methods of those who hitherto have, legally or illegally, escaped the payment of taxation.

There is no doubt the fiscal sieve has many holes, but I promise you that I will mend them. Apart from that no increase of taxation is contemplated. I am asked on all sides whether new sacrifices will be imposed on the taxpayers. I answer that we will impose upon those who defraud the State the sacrifice of ceasing to defraud it.

Every day I receive offers from thousands of workmen to work free of charge for the State for one hour daily. We do not propose to accept this sacrifice, but we do propose to tax the higher paid workers, not so much for fiscal reasons as for political and moral reasons. . . .

Finance founded on the principle of persecution of capital would be madness; in order to progress the nation needs a continual influx of capital.

His speech, which met with Mussolini's enthusiastic approval, was warmly received by the Parliament, with the exception of the extreme Left. The Socialists and Communists alone had from the first objected to granting full powers to the new Government.

Two days after the Chamber placed all power in

Mussolini's hands, the Senate also gave to his Cabinet a unanimous vote of confidence. His speech on this occasion was remarkable for its bluntness. He told the Senate that he would be pleased if it accorded him a unanimous vote, but that he would not be excessively flattered by it. For those Senators who turned enthusiastically towards him, inspired by the motive of fear, he held nothing but deep contempt. "As against doubtful friends, I prefer sincere adversaries." The Senate extended Mussolini's full powers for bureaucratic and fiscal reform until June 30, 1923. It had been demonstrated, he told the Senators, that there was only one way of ejecting from the Government the objectionable political class, and that was by revolution.

But I have circumscribed the revolutionary Government within certain limits. I have not got drunk with my success. I might easily have closed Parliament and installed a dictatorship, as nothing could resist the mystic obedience of my 300,000 black shirts.

I trusted this spectacle would be sufficient to induce the Chamber to change its methods, but I was disillusioned when thirty-six resolutions were presented for a vote of confidence in the Government. This convinced me that if it was not disillusioned the Chamber needed at least a long vacation.

He had no fetiches, Mussolini said, not even that of liberty. He lived to save Italy and knew that if he failed he was "a finished man," but this could not deter him from fearlessly carrying out his work, for he considered liberty "a duty and not a right."

I am not afraid of words. Therefore I proclaim myself the prince of reaction. But I will not follow an anti-proletariat policy. I will not oppress the proletariat, but will elevate them materially and spiritually, not because their number entitles them to special rights. No great nation can be created when workmen are obliged to suffer from a low standard of living.

If I fail I will be a finished man, because no one can try the same experiment twice. It is not of myself I am thinking, because I do not count, but of the nation, because such a failure would be grave for Italy. The rudder of the Italian ship is strongly in my hands. I will not yield it to anybody. But I will not refuse anybody the right to join my crew and help me with advice and work.

In his foreign policy Mussolini is credited with the intention of asking for a revision of the system of mandates in order to give Italy a chance to share with Great Britain and France in the economic advantages and raw materials of Asia Minor. "Italy's ideal in foreign policy is peace," he said in his speech before the Senate, "and therefore not imperialism."

But there is to be no renunciation of the possibility of having recourse to arms, which would render us powerless before negotiating. I believe I succeeded in changing the idea of our Allies and other countries by showing them our country under iron discipline, wishing to work and live, unwilling to follow the chariot of European policy as a handmaiden, but ready to defend with all her means her sacred rights conquered with her blood.

He believes the Turks should not be allowed to extend their sovereignty west of the Maritza River, the boundary of Eastern Thrace, except for Karagatch, which is a railway terminus for Adrianople.



## Exaggerated Politeness to the Turks

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN

**I**T is an interesting commentary on the optimistic prophecies spread broadcast during the war, in which the preservation and protection of the Armenians were not forgotten, that the Turk has come out of the conflict not only distinguished apparently for his amiable qualities, but triumphant.

While the unfortunate King of Greece was struggling against the Turkish incubus, and all the thinking world knew that right was on his side, or at least that he was fighting for Christian civilization, England and France were apparently interested in preserving their prestige with their Mohammedan subjects; and those very ardent Evangelicals who are sending missionaries to the Turks, and who feel that the Armenians ought to be saved, seem to have made no effort to tear our Government from its complacent attitude to its ally, Great Britain.

If the King of Greece, who reigned during the war, was suspected of being not too devoted to the Allies, and if the successor, who recently abdicated, opposed the dismembering policy of Venizelos, the pet of the Allies, it ought to be remembered, as a counterbalance that the Turks were the most ardent and energetic friends of our late enemies in the World War. But the Allies forgave this, and our Government seems to forgive it, too, one of the first examples of Christian forgiveness ever practised by Governments that notoriously have no consciences!

But the past is past. Most people who profess to believe in the doctrines of Christianity in this country, have been aroused too late by the present attitude of the Turks; and it is said, with some reason, that the results of the late election were due in a measure to the horror awakened by our Government's neglect of the interests of the unhappy Armenians. It is amazing that the Christians of our country could so soon forget the deliberate massacre of the Armenian populations in 1915. These massacres were the result of religious hatred and of that determination of the Turks to extirpate, not only all Christians in their dominion, but to satisfy their jealousy of all peoples who represented reasonable Occidental progress.

The verified reports on the Armenian atrocities seem to be forgotten. It was not to the interest of anybody to exaggerate Armenian atrocities as it was to emphasize the criminal blunders of the Germans. But the spectacle of 300 Christian children driven into the sea by Turkish officials, the detention of scores of Armenian families, kept in cattle trains, stationary, for days at a time, dying of thirst and hunger and suffocation, until the mothers were forced to throw their children from the car-windows in the hope that they might have a few more hours to live, are all completely forgotten, or are only dimly recalled.

Roberts College in Constantinople has been held up be-

fore the world as a center for the teaching of Protestant Christianity; but it is well known now that the tendency of the Turks is to force all Christian teachings from the curriculum of that institution as they have done in other establishments.

The last remnants of the old Byzantine population have been cast out. These folk have great traditions; they were prosperous, they tilled the soil industriously; they formed the nucleus of a higher civilization among barbarians. They are today practically all in exile and in poverty. No specious diplomatic conversations, no pretense for political purposes on the part of England or France, should blind Americans to the terrible injustice now being worked by the Turkish party in power. The Turks recognize no difference between national and religious determination. There is no real Turk in power who has not secretly vowed, or publicly avowed, his devotion to the cause of Mohammed and his consequent hatred of Christianity, which means to him the civilization of the Occident.

Moreover, Christianity as a system for governing the conduct of man, is despised among the Turks. Since the war, it has come to mean to them, as it does to the Chinese and to all the Eastern races, a system in which the aeroplane, U-boat, poison gas and Zeppelin have taken the place of the Crucifix. It represents to them complicated methods of destruction which have immeasurably weakened the destroyers themselves.

If those officials in the East, who represent Western civilization, could be induced to display their collections of pictures and inflammatory circulars distributed by the Turkish party in power, we should begin to understand that the Turkish attitude is as uncompromising toward Christianity as it was in the furious days of the successors of Mohammed. The Turk does not send out missionaries; he sends out warriors; you accept the Koran or you die; or, if there are European gunboats to protect you, he waits until the gun-boats disappear and then he exiles you. For a time, superior force made him wear a mask. Today he exposes himself as he really is.

All Christians in the United States would do well to watch carefully the proceedings at Lausanne, which our Government, occupied with interior political affairs, has not treated seriously enough. Now, Congress may perhaps be alarmed by the anarchy in the Balkans, by the sudden knowledge which probably the most ignorant body in the United States, the late Congress, did not realize before, that the Turks are committing horrors that make the angels weep and lead men to despair. The Armenian question was too long considered a merely local problem. It did not concern us very greatly. There were small

groups of earnest Christians who were constantly trying to force the hand of the Administration—that is, every administration from the time of Harrison—to protect Smyrna. In answer to the remonstrances of a body of clergymen who came to Colonel Roosevelt, to ask him to take Smyrna, he once said: "If we attempt to take Smyrna it means war." And the spokesman of the body of the clergymen said: "But we are pacifists!" And that seemed to end the matter for the moment, though President Roosevelt had no use for the Turks. He knew their ways.

We have good reason to believe that President Harding has not been inactive, and also that the value of his activities and those of the Secretary of State will soon become apparent. They have doubtless prevented the Turk from going to the full length of his atrocious intentions. But a crisis is now at hand when our Government—the decision lies with Congress—must realize that the Turk today is the most bitter enemy of Christianity in existence. And if there are those among our Senators and Representatives who prefer not to act in the interests of Christianity, they must at least consider the interests of Occidental civilization.

## The Value of Presumption

SAMUEL FOWLE TELFAIR, JR.

A GREAT deal is being said and written these days with regard to the presumption of the young, their lack of modesty, especially as manifested in their literary productions. Accepting the dictionary definition of presumption as "a passing beyond the ordinary bounds of good-breeding, respect, or reverence," those who so describe the writings of contemporary youth are exactly right, for these young people do not remain within the ordinary bounds set up by their elders, but pass beyond, unduly confident pioneers and navigators, into wide lands and over stormy seas, bold men seeking for themselves the heart of mystery or the light that illumines beauty. Ten or twenty years from now they will have grown old, perhaps beaten; they too will sit upon senatorial seats and complain of irreverence and impudence. Soft-handed, they will fear revolt and commiserate the insolence of adventure. Oh, the pity and the wonder of it! The tragedy will not lie in the broken hearts and unfinished lives, but in the *de rigueur* comedy of men grown old before their time with no presumption to remember.

Now "the ordinary bounds of good-breeding, respect and reverence" are not definite bounds but indefinable mental fences built by one's own instinct, imagination and desire. If we do not venture to presume or dare trespass on the mental fences of others we become static people, slaves to superimposed and probably unworthy orthodoxy, manacled to us by the cautious words of men grown old before their day.

It is youth's right to presume, his adventure to pioneer, to think himself a discoverer while you wonder what he is coming to, though all the time you know he will land in the same place you did with more or less the same treasures gathered in the same Arabias and Cathays. And all the time you realize that the courageous way—and youth is courageous—is to discard the directions and moth-worn experiences of men who are ashamed of their folly and try one's wings purposing to sail into the sun. But whether the fledgling falls to the ground or, bird-like, soars and dips into the immensity of uncharted sky, over the green hills and sparkling seas, breathing the rarer air of heaven and riding on the whispering winds of God, be sure there will be many men to shake their heads, rub their hands and solemnly say: "Things were never like that in my time."

It is not their fault. You cannot expect those critics to show you how better to use your wings or talents, or to encourage your failures. To them each day is not a time to grow in, hours for the unfolding of life, for thinking on mystery or feeling the ever beating ecstasy of beauty that lives in true joy or true suffering. They have ceased to live and are bent on carrying on a perfectly proper existence between the orthodox boundaries of life until formal Death comes to claim them, whereupon with perfect good-breeding they will depart this life saying, with fitting decorum: "I told you so."

Life after all is one long presumption. A muddy, unkempt soldier once knelt in the early morning before a crucifix that stood in the transept of a great church. A new sun filtering, flickering, catching jeweled gleams in an enormous rose-window, filled the place with magic light as the *poilu* prayed there in the darkness of loneliness and self-disgust. A red arrow of God darted into his mind that day and opened there something never before awakened. The white, tortured Suffering hanging above him was the Beauty for which men sought, the Beauty of understanding sacrifice, the meaning of life. The imagination thus awakened vivified life, mirroring valleys, mountains, seas of undreamt of loveliness, lit by the Sun of Truth and caressed by the four winds of God. Even so, many centuries before, Pietro de Bernadone, son of the wealthy merchant of Assisi, took Poverty for his bride and for his brothers the Sun, Fire and Water, and his sons were multiplied and today wander over the earth, singing as he sang:

*Altissimo onnipotente, bon Signore,  
Tue son le laudi, la gloria e l'onore e ogni benedizione  
A te solo altissimo, si confanno  
E nullo uomo enne degno te mentore.*

Ignatius Loyola was a soldier, fighting for earthly gain when he was grievously wounded and on his bed of suffering he saw a light. To follow it he had to go back to school with little boys. He persevered and the one soldier has bequeathed us legion warriors of the mind, who saw a light and followed.



Look now at the glorious sinner walking unbidden though ashamed into the house of the orthodox. She presumes to enter the banquet hall, to break open her box of alabaster and with rich ointment wash her Master's feet and dry those same weary feet with her gleaming hair. You can hear the slurring remarks, see the sneers and contemptuous looks leveled at this unworthy impudent, but do you not remember how later she waited at His tomb, torn with agony and desire to serve, how she asked him whom she thought the gardener where they had laid Him whom she loved and answering He called "Mary," and she, turning, saw Him and cried "Rabboni" (which is to say "Master")? Glories of Glories, made manifest to such a presumer!

And elsewhere the Gospel relates how as Our Lord came down from the mountains, a leper, hideous and loathsome, ventured to draw near Him saying, "Lord if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean" and the answer came clear: "*Volo, Mundare*," and forthwith his leprosy was cleansed. Not long after this the Son of Man was brought before the courts of Justice. This Carpenter, Joseph's son, for three years a wandering preacher, was by His death to save the world, atoning for the sins of past and future men. How *unduly confident, audacious, insolent* must this have seemed to His judges, this superlatively beautiful, this Divine adventure.

Perhaps I have not succeeded in proving the value of presumption, nor will the fact that early in the morning each day in many thousand places poor human wretches beat their breasts and cry, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof but only say the word and my soul shall be healed," and then—Divine presumption—these persons walk unto His table to be fed.

I have none of the theology of the Aquinian or the piety of St. John of God and yet, presumption though it be, I have tried and will try to write of such subjects as might seem to belong peculiarly to them, for I wonder at them and if you study wonder long enough you may learn secrets there, that explain things which lie "beyond the ordinary bounds of good-breeding, respect or reverence." It is this which leads me to select the following passages from a note book kept during a season of retreat, when I was provided with ample opportunity for exercising this faculty of wonder:

MASS. My "angel" knocks on the door and I rise to go to Mass. We enter the large chapel and Brother G. and I kneel in the rear behind the novices. At 6.30, from doors on either side of the altar, enter priests and servers for the nine side altars and then an old priest and two servers for the main altar. We are all on our knees now and most of us use missals, reading the same words. After the Gospel, we sit while all around the chapel little bells say "*Sanctus*," or "This is My Body," "This is the Chalice of My Blood," before the main bell sounds for us, "*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*." Every heart there is repeating "*Sanctus*." Then awe steals through the crowd and as they bend low the bell rings out over the silence, "*Hoc est enim Corpus Meum*," and love supplants awe at the beautiful, hopeful, all merciful, "*Hic est enim Calix*

*Sanguinis Mei novi et aeterni testamenti? Mysterium fidei; qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*"

And the "*Mysterium fidei*" is accomplished. The men go up to receive in rows in what order I do not know. The middle of my side starts first and at last Brother G. and I. There is no rail, and I am last and least. O God, thanksgiving always that I am there at all! "*Domine non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum sed tantum dic verbo et sanabitur anima mea.*"

The centurion's humility is to each of these two hundred men, to each of them the leper's ugliness seems his own before the beauty of the Son of God. "*Itc missa est.*" "*Deo Gratias, Deo Gratias, Deo Gratias.*" "*And in the beginning was the Word. . .*"

We kneel again. My poor knees groan. Silence after prayers, lights out, for fifteen minutes. Surely there are no weak-kneed men here. I listen for the bell, it will never ring. It does. We pass the statue of the great Basque and an old Basque song comes into my mind. Something of this sort must be in every mind for the refrain goes, "In me, in me, in me is God!"

Outside, day has opened a miracle of gold and blue to lighten the riotous death of autumn. The river gleams in the sun. But each day is born at St. Andrew not with rose-colored light stealing up on gray shadows and bathing in quiet waters where evening stars still linger, but with the bell that rings in their many hearts to tell—"Mysterium fidei," that the Son of man has come.

BENEDICTION. Day is over; darkness lies over the land; the wind moans in the trees and leaves rustle and whirl and fall saying, "winter comes." My "angel" knocks again and we go into the dim-lit chapel. Man after man, all cassock-clad, enters, does his reverence and kneels. The organ plays Bach-Gounod's "*Ave*" tonight. How glorious it is, rolling praise and homage to the Blessed Mother. Lights are lit; many candles; on the side of the church in a little chapel, red lamps burn where an effigy of St. Stanislaus lies, for this is his week and in his honor there is Benediction. The priest enters and kneels and all sing "*O Salutaris hostia*." One man near me has a good tenor, the one next to me on the right has not; on my left is Brother G., who caresses each word as he sings it. Choruses of Wagner, symphonies of Beethoven, songs of Schubert, bring us beauty of sound, but not as this. The tempo is probably wrong, but the melody is of many hearts that reach a climax when the "*Tantum Ergo Sacramentum*" follows.

Augustine said: "Too late have I known Thee, O ancient Beauty!" perhaps, presumptuous thought, he meant Truth. For much beauty makes you sad. And so with incense, and melody made of a song of hearts, worship is consummated. We bend low as the blessing is given and rise to sing a hymn. No, beauty is not sad, philosophers; it is glorious, triumphant, for it has youth unafraid to live for it. The men burst into "*Salve Regina. Salve, Salve, Salve!*"

Night has come thickly now. The "world" and "freedom" lie beyond the gates of St. Andrew. A motor takes me away. Going, I hear happy laughter and busy noises. Supper is ready. But as the car rolls along, I hear songs singing themselves without music, it is the melody of melodies, because it has come from the heart of youths who know like Stanislaus what love is, and seeing, fear not, doubt not, but sing "*Salve, Salve, Salve Regina.*"

And so the sun has long since set and another day is over. Dawn and twilight, day's light, night's mystery lie asleep with Benediction. And dreams come, poignant, clutching ones, or wide-eyed pointing ones. Perhaps we cannot even dream, for after all, it is the Galahads who dream and seek the grail, Galahads like the young novices who kneel to hear the sanctus-bells and rise to sing their *Salves*. As for us who wander in this vale of tears, presumptuous lepers, sometimes we too can dream better for that we have seen Galahad in his quest, and heard him sing at Benediction and mayhap even inarticulately have hummed in our own hearts an adoration and a *Salve*, a *Sanctus* and a *Benedictus*.

So on leaving the novitiate, I found that I had acquired some fresh and lasting ideas on "The Value of Presumption."

## Traffic In Polish Souls

CHARLES PHILLIPS.

A YEAR or so ago the English writer, Sir Philip Gibbs, published in London a post-war novel called "Wounded Souls," a story the theme of which, in ten words, was this: that souls were wounded and left derelict by the war just as well as bodies. I read the book in Poland, and there it had a particular significance, because in Poland I had made the horrible discovery that souls had not only been wounded by the war, as they were in every country participating in the world conflict, but that Polish souls were regarded as legitimate spoils of war, loot, to be trafficked in like so much material property.

This is in itself a shameful thing. But what makes a still greater tragedy of it to the American observer is the fact that it is the Christian friends of Poland, the Americans, who are trafficking in Polish souls, or, to be more specific, some Americans, particularly those who are working in Poland under the name of the "American Methodist Mission."

The activities of the Methodist Mission of America in Poland do not fall short of scandalous. This is a fact not known, I am sure, to the general body of Methodists in this country; at least it was unknown to my own Methodist friends here at home, every one of whom, hearing the facts, has been honestly shocked and horrified at certain actions of their missionaries in Poland, whose salaries they have been helping to pay without knowing how the money was being spent. And yet, the story of the Methodist Mission in Poland is an old and very much worn tale, one that has been enacted in other countries before, although never with quite such a savage disregard of honesty and human rights or such a flagrant prostitution of the good name of American charity. It is a story of proselyting, done under the cloak of charity, but of proselyting carried on at such a pace and at such a cruel advantage over the native victims of war that even workers of the Mission itself have protested and withdrawn rather than continue to associate themselves with it. I personally know two such cases of Methodist Mission workers who left the Mission in Poland because of its unprincipled activities, which they themselves characterized as un-American and un-Christian; one of them, not having engaged in the work until a definite understanding had been set down on paper that the work of the Mission was relief work pure and simple, quit because this agreement was broken; the other, a person in authority, and a loyal Methodist of the first order, declaring an honest willingness to preach "good old Methodism" to the Poles, was forced to resign, having refused absolutely to camouflage the missionary work of the organization as those in control of the Mission demanded.

It is this camouflage that has branded the work of the Methodist Mission in Poland as dishonest and unworthy the support of conscientious Methodists at home in America. For in Poland the Methodists, besides carrying on the ordinary open missionary activity which they feel is permitted to such an organization as theirs, have at the same time worked with the tools of subterfuge and deceit to a shameful extent. This fact was revealed with dramatic emphasis last year in the case of a school and orphanage opened by the Mission in the suburbs of Warsaw. A public scandal resulted.

The story is this, and anyone desiring to authenticate it may do so by referring to the files of the Warsaw daily newspapers of September and October, 1921. In 1920 the Methodists purchased an old house on an estate near Warsaw and, with much heralding by press publicity, remodeled it at great expense and established in it a school for refugee children and war orphans. Just what means were used by the Mission in gathering up the children enrolled in this school I do not know; but the point is, that, because the children were Catholic children, the school and home was opened not as a Methodist institution, nor even as a nonsectarian institution, but ostensibly as a Catholic school! Its sole purpose, as advertised, was to save the children from destitution and to give them the advantage of a schooling according to the best Polish and American ideals. So cleverly did the Mission play up this supposed laudable purpose that it even won the approval and protection of the local Catholic Church authorities, Cardinal Kakowski, Archbishop of Warsaw, actually appointing a priest as guardian of the institution, a chaplain who was given *carte blanche* by the Methodists in the care of the young souls they were rescuing. A Catholic woman was likewise employed as matron of the home.

The prestige which this foundation gave the Methodist Mission in the eyes of the Polish public was great. "Surely," said the Poles, "these American Methodists are a truly Christian people, whose sole motive is the purest charity." The words "Methodist" and "Methodism," in fact hitherto unknown in the Polish vocabulary and as meaningless to the average Pole as "Tammany" or "Prohibitionist," became synonymous with goodness and kindness, while to those who knew that Methodism was a Protestant sect the activity of the Mission was a revelation of broadminded and unselfish liberality—another score for the fair name of America abroad. But time was to make its own disclosures.

After the school had operated for a year things began to change. The Catholic matron, in spite of a five-year contract, was discharged, paid the full five years' salary, but discharged. Then one morning, very soon afterward, the guardians and parents of the children woke up to find an astonishing document in their hands, a letter from the Methodist Mission giving them a certain specified time in which to sign and return an enclosed paper delivering over to the full control of the Mission not only the bodies but



the souls of the little ones, whose spiritual direction and religious training was to be henceforth in the hands of the Mission. There was a choice of alternatives, either the children were to be put under Evangelical instruction and raised as Methodists, or they must get out. Unless the required paper were signed and witnessed by a notary and filed with the Mission within a given time, the children must find shelter elsewhere. It did not appear to matter to the directors of the Mission who were perpetrating this outrage against them where the youngsters might go, nor did it seem of any concern (beyond the expression of a perfunctory word of regret) that these children, without this place that had been made for them in the name of Christian and American charity, would be hungry and maybe homeless. There is but one choice to make, either Methodism and comfort and education, or their traditional Faith and the old brutal refugee round of life again.

This affair created a real scandal in Poland. Protestant Poles joined their Catholic brethren in denouncing it. The Catholic chaplain was forced, of course, to withdraw immediately. The Cardinal, publishing in the daily press his condemnation of the Mission's act, told plainly how the Church authorities, as well as the children's parents and guardians and the public in general, had been fooled; but he said, plainly also, that it was not as Methodists that the proselyters were condemned—legally Methodists had a right to open a Methodist school if they wished—but as deceivers and perpetrators of a shameful trick on the confidence of a suffering and needy people. The story came to a dramatic climax when the children themselves, taking a banner of the Blessed Virgin which they had made with their own hands, marched in a body from the school to the neighboring church, depositing their standard there because they could no longer keep it at the school. There was no place any more for the Blessed Virgin or any other such "Romish superstition" in that once homelike place.

Every American in Poland, and every American relief organization working there, suffered from this Methodist scandal, even the American Red Cross, which from beginning to end of its Polish career has won the praise of all Poles for what Cardinal Kakowski called "the honesty and delicacy of its methods of operation." The whole name American, in fact, was injured and made suspect by this Warsaw affair.

This happening undoubtedly spread alarm in the Methodist Mission; there were rumors of reprimands from Methodist headquarters at home for the blunder that had been made. But it did not result in the reform of the Mission in Poland, on the contrary the proselyting efforts of the brethren were redoubled, only on a new line of attack. When the nature of this was revealed in a recent editorial in the *Kurjer Warszawski*, the most respected and widely circulated daily paper in Poland, people were aghast. According to the *Kurjer Warszawski*, the latest medium

seized upon by the Methodist Mission to secure an underfooting in Poland is nothing more or less than the Communist party, the Bolsheviki! The *Kurjer Warszawski* has categorically accused the Methodist Mission of permitting the use of its so called religious meetings for the spread of Bolshevist propaganda.

No one, of course, believes for a moment that Methodists are Bolsheviki; that on the face of it is absurd. But everyone in Europe (and in America, too, I suppose) knows that one sure way of appealing to the most susceptible masses, to the ignorant, to the proletariat, as the Bolsheviki love to put it, is to attack along the lines of class passion. So in Poland today, if such a reputable witness as the foremost daily paper of the country is to be believed, we have the Methodist Mission of America driven to the desperate measure of using Communist, Bolshevist, propaganda in order to get to the people and pervert them from their traditional Catholic Faith! If the name American suffered injury abroad by reason of the Warsaw school scandal, what is to be expected now, with the Stars and Stripes intertwined in the public mind with the bloody Red flag of the Russian Terror? And be it noted, the Methodist Mission in Poland is not backward about making generous display of the Stars and Stripes wherever it sets its tents.

The indignation which my personal Methodist friends have expressed on hearing these things makes me confident that the whole Methodist body here at home, once the facts are made known, will rise up to repudiate, or at any rate to investigate the actions of their missionaries in Poland. It is as an American citizen, jealous of the good name of our flag and our country, that I tell what I know of the injury being done our nation in the young Republic of Poland through the Methodist Mission's shameless trafficking in souls.

## Luther and the Bible

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

ON page 22 of the edition of Luther's "Tabletalk," published at Eisleben in 1566, the following words may be read: "When I was young, I acquainted myself with the Bible, read the same often so that I knew where any reference was contained and could be found when any one spoke about it." In this short sentence the sometime friar of Wittenberg gives a death blow to one of the myths which his propagandists so cleverly created. That myth nevertheless is being revived. For some time past the Lutheran churches in the United States and abroad have been trying to stir up a belated enthusiasm in behalf of the German reformer. But Luther centenaries, that of the four hundredth anniversary of the challenge he issued from Wittenberg in 1517 against the Catholic doctrine of indulgences, and that of the four hundredth anniversary of his formal break with Rome at Worms, 1521, failed, for evident reasons in their appeal. In spite of these failures,

the followers of the German friar did not give up the attempt to glorify him at any cost. Another Luther centenary, that of the four hundredth anniversary of his translation of the New Testament (September, 1522) into the language of the German people, seemed to afford them a favorable occasion. Luther, the discoverer of the Bible; Luther, the rescuer of the sacred volume from the clutches of Rome which hid it from the people in ecclesiastical dungeons and the dust-laden shelves of monkish libraries, is now the slogan.

Myths and historical lies are long lived. But few myths, perhaps, have enjoyed such healthy longevity as that of Luther's discovery and rescue of the Bible from Roman tyranny. The fable is refuted in the very words of Luther's "Tabletalk," quoted above. In his youth, a youth passed entirely under Catholic influences and religious teachers, Luther confesses that he acquainted himself with the Bible and was familiar with its teaching. It cannot therefore have been such a sealed book either to him or to his fellow students. It is not true, therefore, as he says in another part of his works, with his usual disregard of the contradiction into which he stumbles, that Popery "had kicked Scripture under the bench" (Works, Erlangen ed., vol. XLII, p. 280). Luther's admission in the "Tabletalk" refutes the statement. Protestant scholars of the highest authority, Kohler, Walther, Geffken, Grimm, Thudichum, Dobschütz, Kolde, Kropatchek, give no credence whatever to the myth of Luther's rescue of the Word of God from the enslaving grip of Popery. The rule of the Augustinian Order to which Luther belonged and of which, in the earlier part of his religious life, he seems to have been a faithful member, enjoined upon its novices "to read the Scripture assiduously, hear it devoutly and learn it fervently." This does not bear out the charge that Popery had "kicked the Scriptures under the bench." On the contrary, the Augustinian rule gave the sacred volume the highest place of honor. At Erfurt, where Luther studied, and the same is true of every other center of learning in Europe at the time, Biblical studies were flourishing. Everywhere, both the sacred text itself as well as countless Biblical commentaries were in the hands of masters and pupils.

Luther by his translation popularized the Bible in Germany. He did nothing more. In spite of his assertion that the work of translation was entirely his own, even Protestant authorities like Reichert (Grisar, "Luther," vol. III., p. 463) admit it is quite probable that Luther had older German translations at his elbow when he worked at his own, a translation which Catholic historians, Biblical scholars and theologians, acquainted with the German language, willingly admit to be an achievement worthy of admiration, if considered in its literary aspects alone and apart from its dogmatic errors and falsification and unscrupulous mutilation of the text. The charge that he could mutilate texts ought not to be dreamt of in connec-

tion with the man who is heralded by his admirers as the rescuer of the Word of God. Yet Luther mutilated the sacred text in a reckless manner. In the translation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he was not ashamed to insert the word "alone" in the twenty-eighth verse of the third chapter: "For we account a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law," says the Apostle. Luther says: "by faith alone." When brought to task by his Catholic opponents for his travesty of the sacred text, he insolently replied: "When your Papist gives himself useless trouble about the word 'alone,' just tell him Dr. Martin Luther wills it so and says: 'Papist and jackass are one and same. *Sic volo, sic jubeo: sit pro ratione voluntas.* Thus I will have it, thus I order it; let my will stand for the reason why." This is the language of the tavern and tap-room, not the answer of a man filled with reverence for the truth and the written word of God.

Luther treated the Bible as his tool. It was not thus that the countless translators of the Word of God who had preceded him both in Germany and in other countries of Europe had dealt with the sacred volume. Long before Martin Luther came to carry disunion, hatred and discord into his own Germany and then into other European countries, the Bible was known, loved, studied, printed, sold by booksellers, translated into German and the principal European languages.

In those very ages which the enemies of the Catholic Church called some years ago the "Dark Ages," the Bible was in honor among the people. Undoubtedly the work entailed on manuscript copies of the Bible, the high price of materials, the relatively small number of those who could read, rendered copies of the sacred volume rare. But, as Dean Maitland proves in his "Dark Ages," that book which first laid bare the falsehood of the attacks on the Ages of Faith and showed them partially at least in their true light, the teachings and spirit of the Bible were well known to the people. They permeated their lives. The writings of these ages, says the English author, were "made of the Scriptures."

I do not merely mean [he says], that the writers constantly quoted the Scriptures, and appealed to them as authorities on all occasions . . . but I mean that they thought and spoke and wrote the words and phrases of the Bible, and that they did this constantly and habitually as the natural mode of expressing themselves.

The Bible was the great textbook of the Middle Ages. It was the textbook of the monks, for in countless monasteries, from Melrose in the Scottish hills to cloisters along the Loire, the Danube and the Rhine, the main occupation of Cluniacs, Benedictines and others was to study, to copy and illuminate the Bible. It was the textbook of the university doctor in Paris and Alcalá; of the scholar, the guildsman and the peasant. Its echoes were heard in the popular hymns of the people; its prophets, patriarchs and kings appeared before them in the old mystery plays, our first truly popular drama. Its scenes, creation, judgment, hell and Heaven, were molded in stone on the portals



of Rheims and Cologne; its heroes and heroines greeted our forefathers in the statues of Chartres and Amiens, in the carven wonders of Venice and Nuremberg. From the stained glass windows of Chartres, York and Poitiers, the whole story of the Bible, the life and death and resurrection of the Son of God, the miracles of the Old and New Testament glinted and blazed before the eyes of peasant and king with a splendor and a beauty that can never be surpassed, perhaps never equalled. The language, the phraseology of our fathers in the Faith was molded of the very marrow of the Scriptures. In spirit and substance, the Middle Ages and the days that immediately preceded Luther's time, knew the Bible better perhaps than we know it today. The preaching was biblical, the books of devotion were but the Bible extended, popularized, brought down to the level of the understanding of the poorest and humblest. Luther did not discover the Bible. His Catholic forefathers had been familiar with its teachings for centuries. When about 1450, the art of printing was discovered by Guttenberg, Koster, Fust, the Bible was the first book to be printed.

It is difficult to gather definite statistics with regard to the number of early printed Bibles. Almost every year Biblical students, research workers and historians discover old printed Bibles hitherto unclassified. In 1910, Mr. R. A. Peddie published in London his "Index or Catalogue of Fifteenth Century Books." From the middle of the fifteen century to the end, the printing trade may be said to have had a real "boom." Luther was born while that boom was at its height, November 11, 1483. At the end of the century in 1500, he was a little over seventeen years of age. At that date, according to Mr. Peddie, a recognized bibliographical expert, 177 editions of the entire Bible had been printed in Europe. Of these 134 were in Latin, 15 in German, 13 in Italian, 11 in French, 2 in Bohemian, 1 in Dutch and 1 in Spanish. In an article entitled "Pre-Reformation Bibles," originally written in the *Seraphic Home Journal* and reprinted in the *Catholic Mind* (November 22, 1919) Rev. John M. Lenhardt, O. M. Cap., adding to the foregoing information, says that since each of the 177 editions of the Bible was issued in at least 300 copies, at least 53,100 copies of the entire Bible were printed in the fifteenth century; 40,200 of these were in Latin, and 12,900 in the vernacular, a startling fact which proves the intense interest taken in the sacred book.

In all that work, Luther had no other share but that of the passive scholar who in his classes was profiting of the labors of others. Long before Luther gave even the first part of his German translation of the Bible to the public (1522) the printed Bible was, as Father Lenhardt admirably proves by statistics, a "best seller" at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. In "Appendix A" of Miss J. M. Stone's "Reformation and Renaissance," there is a descriptive list of the Bibles lent to the Caxton Exhibition at the British Museum, 1877.

All the Bibles mentioned were printed during the sixty-six years between the setting-up of the first printing press about 1450 and the publication of Erasmus' translations of the New Testament from Greek into Latin, in 1516. Over eighty Bibles are listed, briefly described and when possible, place and date of publication are given. Luther was born in 1483. In that year, the list informs us, the "ninth German edition of the Bible" was published at Nuremberg. What had Luther to do as translator with that ninth edition of the Bible in German or the fourteen others in the same language mentioned in the Caxton exhibition list? Absolutely nothing. His Catholic forefathers, German scholars whose work, in all probability helped him in his own translation, had already given the Scriptures to the people in their own tongue. In picturesqueness and vigor of language, they might not perhaps compare with the Friar of Wittenberg. But they had at least respected the Word of God. They never attempted as Luther shamefully did, to mutilate its text and falsify its message.

#### COMMUNICATIONS

*The Editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department*

##### The K. of C. History Commission

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"For *Columbia*," says Captain Elbridge Colby, in your issue of November 25, wherein he gives a rather valuable analysis of the sympathetic viewpoint of the K. of C. history work, "has printed an article claiming that American history as now taught has been Anglicized."

*Columbia* did more than print an article "claiming" this. It printed an article proving exactly what Captain Colby quotes. Charles Edward Russell wrote the article. He is not a Knight of Columbus; he is not an Irish-American; he is not a Catholic. But he is admittedly one of the ablest journalists that ever graced the city desk of a New York newspaper, and he wrote for *Columbia* a record of his own experience with a British propagandist, which I rather buoyantly captioned "Behind the Propaganda Scenes." I respect British brains, for they are plentiful, as much as any man; I respect British patriotism, for it is genuine and effective and, as a rule, non-hysterical, but British propaganda I shall never respect, nor the propaganda of any nation that seeks advantage at America's expense through the delusion of Americans. If *Columbia* can obtain other articles as interesting and authoritative as Mr. Russell's, it will print them simply because, as the official publication of an organization of Catholic men revering, above all things, the truth, it deems it a duty to do so. Incidentally, I may mention that Mr. Russell's article evoked a surprising chorus of praise from *Columbia's* readers.

New York.

JOHN B. KENNEDY.  
Editor of "*Columbia*."

##### A Catholic Vigilance Committee

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the editorial "A Defeat for Americanism" in AMERICA's issue of November 18, it is urged that "In every diocese of this great country there should be a permanent vigilance committee of upstanding educated Catholics, free from the taint of politics, whose sole aim would be the welfare of Church and State." Why free from the taint of politics? Is not the Catholic in politics

better able, because of experience, to work for the welfare of Church and State than would be a Catholic free from the taint of politics? Does not the Catholic in politics have as his sole aim the welfare of Church and State? If not, does a Catholic violate the obligation resting on him or her as an American citizen when he or she votes for a Catholic for public office because he is "one of our own kind?"

While not pretending to know the local situation in Oregon which prompted the adoption of the Compulsory Education act, I doubt very much that "the Klan and the Masons" were in the majority. May not the result of the Oregon election be attributed to some extent to professing Catholics not "free from the taint of politics" who, by their conduct, raise doubts as to the effectiveness of Catholic schools in impressing proper standards of morality on their scholars, so far as morality concerns discharge of public duties? In the minds of a very considerable number of non-Catholics has the Catholic school justified its existence? Do some Catholics think that morality means merely an observance of only the sixth and ninth commandments? If so, where do they get that idea?

A Catholic may fully appreciate the advantages of a Catholic education, but Catholics are in a minority and on a question as to whether the character and intellects of future American citizens should be molded in accordance with a State program the votes of those not convinced that the Catholic school has justified its existence, added to the votes of those who, actuated by bias, would wipe out Catholic education, may well overcome the votes of those who believe in a Catholic educational system.

I opine that it would be a very difficult matter to keep any permanent vigilance committee free from the taint of politics for any length of time in some sections of this country. The supreme danger to the Catholic school is the Catholic "tainted with politics." The handicap does not seem to have been overcome by picturing a "successful politician" seated on a throne and placing the picture on the walls of a Catholic church as the first of the fourteen Stations of the Cross.

New York.

JULIUS C. SCHVEN.

#### Reaching Non-Catholics

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mgr. Noll's letter in the issue of AMERICA for November 18, is much to the point, but does not say enough. Much of the literature broadcasted amongst non-Catholics represents a large waste of effort for the following reasons: (1) As a rule, it is in too bulky a form to be read by many of those to whom it is given. (2) Much of the Catholic literature thus scattered, if read, is not understood. That which can be taken for granted by a Catholic mind looms up large as a difficulty for the average non-Catholic, and this mainly because notwithstanding the much-boasted use of the Bible, that Holy Book is very little read amongst non-Catholics. (3) The average non-Catholic has had prejudice so thoroughly drummed into him that he thinks investigation useless and he will not investigate.

A reform of methods is very much needed. "One pill at a time," and that not too bulky, is a good prescription. Simple language, proceeding usually by comparison, is essential to success. Let us remember that the back-bone of prejudice is with us in the Southwest and that minds trained logically are the exception. Let us take means to force attention, otherwise our efforts will not avail.

As editor of the *Antidote* for eight years (1910-1918), as one who has kept up a long correspondence with thousands of ministers, lawyers, and others of our non-Catholic friends, having been in daily contact with non-Catholics for a quarter of a century, as a priest, I find that the effective way of dealing with non-Catholics is through personal contact. When they are forced to pay attention to the issue in question, then will Catholic literature do good work.

I am of opinion that we should profit by the visit of every anti-Catholic lecturer to bring about this personal contact. Several of these "exs" were in my district lately. I simply asked prominent non-Catholics to investigate the charges made, being confident of the spirit of fair play of the non-Catholic. I volunteered to pay for the costs of investigation, etc. All this was done without personal aspersions of any nature. The results were good. The reasons for such a course are simple. Prominent non-Catholics tell the people they have been humbugged, the people's attention is forcibly drawn to this refutation and they wish to know details. Now, literature is in order. This, in a district where two priests were flogged, in the heart of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, where our white population consists of thirty families in seven counties. There may be better methods, but the point is to *force attention*, then to give them literature suited to their capacity of digestion.

Sweetwater, Texas.

J. A. CAMPBELL.

#### Catholic News in the Secular Press

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with a great deal of interest Mgr. Noll's communication in AMERICA for November 18. I agree heartily with all he says and venture these suggestions in line with the thought he conveys.

It seems to me that our Catholic leaders would do well to encourage Catholic men and women to enter the field of secular journalism. Most of us will admit that the secular newspapers do not give the Catholic Church a fair deal. They misrepresent us. They print grotesque accounts of our services and ceremonials. And when we have real news they underplay it or bury it where you would have to get a magnifying glass to find it.

I do not believe newspapers are averse to printing Catholic news. Look how they featured the news from Rome during the illness and at the death of our late Pontiff, also at the time of the election of a new Pope. I think that most newspapers bury Catholic news because it is not in shape to make intelligible reading to the vast majority of their subscribers. And for this I blame Catholics themselves. Unless there is a Catholic on the news staff of a secular newspaper it is awfully hard to get a good account of anything Catholic, strictly Catholic, into the paper to be read with interest by the Catholic, the Methodist, the Jew, the infidel.

Suppose it is a consecration of a Bishop. What can you expect of a Protestant newspaper reporter assigned to cover the event? Priests are too busy to bother with him. He has to go to the church, snatch what he can, and the poor fellow, by the time he gets back to his office, does not know whether he has been attending a consecration of a Bishop or a vesper service.

I am strong for teaching our Catholic men the profession of journalism or as my old "dad" used to say, "make him a good newspaper man." Catholic papers are fine. I read a dozen of them but I'm not the one who needs enlightenment. My mother taught me at her knee. As Mgr. Noll points out, the ones who need it never see a Catholic paper. But they do see a *New York Times*, a *Philadelphia Ledger*, a *Dayton News*, a *Los Angeles Times*, yes, even a *St. Joseph News Press*.

If I were doing missionary work here in St. Joseph, Mo., I would prefer half a column once a week in our daily paper to the whole paper of our weekly Catholic periodical. Why? I would reach the class who need it most. It is nice to have Catholics read that a Protestant mayor warmly greeted the newly-consecrated Bishop Gilfillan to our city, but it is a heap better to have our thousands of Protestant readers digest this fact!

I do not say any Catholic newspaper men should overplay Catholic news. Far from it. Catholics do not ask that. They do not need it. But we should see that what is written and appears in print is a true account, one that both our Catholic and Protestant readers can grasp. I have seen many news items turned in by priests, wonderfully composed for a person who has been a Cath-



olic all his life, but a Chinese puzzle to a Protestant who has never been inside a Catholic church. It is to the advantage of the Church and to the advantage of the newspaper to have fair news stories, written so they can be enjoyed.

So after reading Mgr. Noll's article, I would suggest first that we encourage our Catholic students to take up journalism; second, that in the absence of Catholics on daily newspapers, Catholics learn to put accounts of their doings in language that will cause non-Catholics to read and enjoy. To me this seems one good way to bring about eventually more converts.

St. Joseph, Mo.

ARTHUR V. BURROWES.

### Why So Few Converts?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Because so few want to be converted. For a non-Catholic, conversion to the Catholic Faith means a change in his life as well as a change in his religion. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me," says the Founder of the Catholic religion. This saying is hard and who wishes to deny himself? The sensual man has no relish for the things of God and we are living in a sensual age. The masses of those outside the Church today are as indifferent to supernatural religion as the people of Athens were in the days of St. Paul.

Even our Blessed Lord, Himself, made very few converts in the more than three years of His public life. Why so few? Simply because those to whom He spoke did not desire to be converted. His teachings did not square with their way of living and they did not want to change their ways. It is so today. The unchurched crowds boast that they don't wish "dogmas or creeds." The fact is, they don't want any commandments.

If the Catholic Church would let down the bars, would change her moral code, there would be converts aplenty. If the Church would not insist upon personal purity and its concomitants, personal mortification and self-denial, converts would come in droves.

To say that prospective converts are discouraged and disappointed by "diatribes in the pulpit instead of sermons," is sheer nonsense. They simply do not go to our churches. Even on the occasion of a non-Catholic mission very few can be induced to attend. And the character of the questions asked evidences a disposition to find objections rather than to learn the truth.

Some one suggests that convert-makers should have been made of the earnestness and perseverance of the salesman. That is true. But no salesman can do business with me if I don't want his goods at any price. Recently an agent tried to sell me a "Concrete Mixer." He easily convinced me that he had the best "mixer" on the market. But I simply was not interested and his eloquence was wasted. So it is with religion. I may easily convince a man that the Catholic religion is the best religion in the world. But if he is not interested, if he feels that he does not need religion of any kind, I am wasting my eloquence on the desert air.

A couple of generations of Godless education have done their work. The "lusty young pagans" coming out of our schools and colleges simply have no use for any kind of religion, much less for a religion which puts binding restraints upon their animal propensities.

Pittsburgh.

D. J. O'SHEA.

### Education for the Workers

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The writer attended a meeting recently the character of which proves the timeliness and need of Father Culeman's article entitled, "The Workers Need Education," published in the issue of AMERICA for November 4. The meeting in question was called by the Workers' Defense Association. Its object as declared in "flyers," and it was well advertised, was to enlist public sympathy on behalf of certain individuals confined in Federal prisons under the Espionage act. The writer has no sympathy for Communism,

but the detention of these men has given rise to much public discussion and many official reports. For instance, on March 16 of this year, Major Sidney Lanier, of the Military Intelligence Department, General Staff, United States Army, declared to a House Judiciary Committee as follows: "In my opinion, none of these men were properly convicted because the indictments were vitally defective. If I had been on the jury, I would not have convicted one of them, etc."

Major Lanier has had twenty years' experience as a lawyer. Therefore, when announcement of the meeting referred to above, was literally thrown in this writer's path, he decided to attend on the presumption that a clear and concise statement of the facts affecting the political prisoners, would be given. For there are matters that touch our American life in common, so he reasoned, on which all shades of divergent political beliefs can jointly confer with a view to bettering things if the facts so warrant, this question of amnesty for instance.

The writer's chagrin and disappointment, therefore, can be imagined when on arriving at the hall he was treated not to the desired facts, but to an oration on Socialism which included many old and some new slanders concerning the Church. The speaker declared that it was the Church's policy to keep the working man in chains, etc., etc., and then went on to tell about Communist Russia's solicitude for her minors as contrasted with the heartless policy of the United States. Now, then, herein lies the tragedy of the situation: Not one Catholic, and there were many in the audience, and all laborers, challenged the speaker's attack on the Church! Why? Because they were not conversant with the facts concerning this vexed question of capital and labor, distribution and production, and so could not make articulate the disgust and disappointment that gripped them. The speaker, although a superficial thinker, was a fluent talker who distorted the fragments of truth which his speech contained, to fit his argument. The incident cited surely proves the force and truth of Father Culeman's article, which, by the way, should be scattered broadcast throughout this land, and his outstanding warning:

That those who stand for moral reform and orderly evolution in our social life shall have to pay much more attention than heretofore to the education of the working classes in all that pertains to their present problems and future welfare.

Those of us who have been solidly grounded in the Faith may, thank God, be immune to the false doctrines, economic and otherwise, peddled out as in this instance. The average worker, however, whose educational assets are built on a sixth-grade foundation, minus the religious armor, which the parish school buckles on its children, is an easy target for the shafts of the Communist and the doctrinaire. By all means, then, let us have "education for the workers" as outlined in Father Culeman's splendid article. Let people's high schools and parish evening classes multiply and thus stem the leakage that is going on in our midst to the detriment of the Church and society. The working people will not only support them, but unless the writer is greatly mistaken, will flock to them. For have they not too often, in store and factory, experienced the humiliation of getting the worst in an argument that centers on the all-embracing questions of production and distribution, and this at the hands of some smooth talker?

It is a splendid piece of work and bound to be far-reaching beyond all computation; essentially Catholic and redolent of the Ages of Faith when intelligence, faith, and superior craftsmanship were the characteristics of the rank and file. Let us hear from the pastors engaged in this pioneer work. The writer recalls that a worker's class was launched a few years ago under the auspices of the Catholic Social Guild, England, and that the initial registration consisted of three pupils. Let us hear from our Catholic groups what is being done in this matter of education for the workers.

Boston.

A. O'BRIEN.

# AMERICA

## A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1922

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The American Press, New York, N. Y.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;  
Treasurer, GERALD C. TREACY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:  
Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

A copy of the index for Volume XXVII of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, Grand Central Terminal, New York City.

### Scrapping the Declaration of Independence

ONCE upon a time the Fathers of our country wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men. . . .

In other words God, the Creator, conferred upon man certain rights of whose exercise he may not be deprived except under most extraordinary conditions and then not by majority vote. To secure the legitimate exercise of these rights, not to confer the rights themselves, government was founded and remains good only as long as it is not "destructive of these ends." So wrote our Fathers in the charter of our liberties, but that was once upon a time, and since then times have changed so much that in *Commerce and Finance*, for November 22, T. H. P. prefixed to an article on school attendance these words beloved of the Bolsheviks:

We live in a democracy in which the majority governs. We have no longer any rights or liberties of which we may not be legally deprived if more than half of our fellow citizens so decide. This is a condition, not a theory. We may not approve of it but we can't help it and if we don't like it our only option is to go somewhere else.

This is very clear even to the bleary-eyed. The Declaration of Independence declares that God is the author of certain inalienable rights. T. H. P. proclaims that there are no such rights, for every human right depends on the majority vote. The upright citizen has a right to life, only if the majority vote grants him that right. He has a right to liberty under the same conditions: to the pursuit of hap-

piness, under like circumstances. The workman's right to his hard-earned wage, the woman's right to her virtue, the citizen's right to freedom of conscience—all the rights that those who founded the Republic declared inalienable now depend upon a slender margin of votes, and thus Bolshevism is glorified in us.

This is a serious matter; it is simple and pure Bolshevik doctrine, the very thing that sound Americans have been denouncing as subversive of freedom and free government. But after all T. H. P. is perhaps not to blame for his utterance. He may have been brought up in a public high school where this doctrine is taught from "Elementary Principles of Economics," by Ely and Wicker, in these words:

The right of private property is so fundamental in our modern civilization that we hardly think of it as resting on the will or consent of society, maintained only by constant vigilance on the part of society, and subject even now to slow and gradual modification. Still less, perhaps, has it ever appeared to most of us as a right that is open to question. The reason for this attitude of mind is that people are ruled in great measure by custom rather than by the light of history and of reason. When any customary right has spread very widely and become deeply rooted in society, men fall into the error of calling it a "natural right." There is, to be sure, a sense in which the property right may be called natural, namely, that the right has been rather the result of a natural evolution than of any conscious convention. But, as usually employed, the term natural right implies that the right is "established by nature" and hence is not to be called in question. In reality there are no such rights. A man in isolation could obviously have no "rights" whatever. The word rights necessarily implies society, and points to the origin of rights not in any abstract nature, but in the grouping of men.—p. 9.

What, then, is the basis of human rights? The preceding discussion should have made it clear that rights do not come from nature in the sense that they thus gain a standing and authority independent of the will or consent of society. Neither are such rights absolute or inherent, though these words have often been mistakenly used in describing them. . . . Practically speaking, therefore, we may all agree that the basis of human rights is social expediency—the proved power to promote the well-being of men in society.—p. 17.

Times have, indeed, changed; the doctrines of our Fathers which our flag symbolizes are disappearing and in their stead are arising the dogmas of the Bolsheviks symbolized by the Red flag. And the blame does not lie with the street orator but with schools and universities supported by unsuspecting citizens.

### The School and the Citizen

"THE failure of our public schools to turn out good citizens and good voters is conspicuous. We shall have to look this fact squarely in the face." The indictment is bitter, but it was not drawn by a Catholic. Its author is President-Emeritus Eliot, speaking at Boston on November 27. All will not agree that it can be sustained. But there should be fair agreement on the proposition, also advanced by Dr. Eliot, that none of our children receive instruction in religion in the public schools, and very few of them at home. Neither the home nor the



school is deeply concerned with what Dr. Eliot finely calls, "The importance of putting into the heart of the child the motive of the love of God." In the mouth of a Catholic, these sentiments are mere truisms. Coming from one who never evinced sympathy with the Church or her institutions, they indicate, it may be hoped, that many non-Catholics are awakening to the social dangers involved in a system which deliberately excludes Almighty God and His law from the school.

Unless we train our children in love of God above all things and in love of all men for the sake of our common Father, we cannot look for a generation of "good citizens and good voters." Lacking an upright citizenry, can this Government, brought into being through the blood and the wisdom of our ancestors, endure? These early Americans were men of vision. Their vision they interpreted to their people. The greatest of them, in his "Farewell Address," warned the American people to beware of the sophism that morality can be long and consistently maintained without religion. And without morality and religion, he concluded, there was no sure foundation for beneficent government.

There is one school system in the United States which is in complete accord with the sentiments expressed by Washington. That system is now under fire in several States, where legislation is sought which will make the Catholic school impossible. Only those schools, it is said, which by law forbid the teaching of all religion, are in harmony with true American ideals. Washington was undoubtedly correct in his insistence upon the theory that a representative democracy can endure only when the people are imbued with the principles of religion. Dr. Eliot is right in his contention that we are not bringing up a religious generation. In view of these facts, how can the suppression of the only schools which teach religion be asked for in the name of "true American ideals"?

#### Who Won the War?

LIKE many another statesman, M. Clemenceau raises more difficulties than he solves. No doubt he can answer to his own complete satisfaction the ancient query, "Who caused the war?" but his reply suggests a question at least as difficult, "Who won the war?" M. Clemenceau does not merely admit that France is in a perilous condition; he insists upon this proposition, and proves it. To begin with, of the 8,000,000 Frenchmen sent to the army and navy, only three million returned able to resume their former work. Of the remaining five million, those not in their graves, are, for the most part, public charges. So much for the loss in human life and human activity. As to the destruction in the commercial world, M. Clemenceau instances the wrecked coal-fields in Northern France and 20,000 manufacturing establishments now in ruins. Could the utter futility of war be portrayed more powerfully?

But the portrait becomes more life-like when the losses

of Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and Austria are considered. In varying degrees, each of these nations came forth from the conflict weakened, and in all of them, the survivors struggle under burdens, moral and financial, caused directly by the war. If the conditions which now prevail are allowed to continue, there is no hope whatever of a reconstruction in Austria, and very little hope for Germany. We may yet be called upon, in the name of our common humanity, to form and support commissions to relieve the starving in Germany. Due to her tremendous financial resources, Great Britain still manages to "carry on" as usual. But if Germany goes down, or in despair, makes common cause with the radicals of Russia, what is left for Continental Europe but anarchy? And how long can Great Britain maintain her position with anarchy at her gates?

There is not a country in the world today, conquered or victorious, in which as a result of war, governmental expenditures have not been doubled or trebled. These expenditures, it must be remembered, must be borne by the common people. In 1914, the per capita expenditure in the United States was \$35. Today it is, approximately \$88. In Great Britain, the per capita rose during the same period, from \$41 to \$130; in France, from \$33 to \$84; in Italy from \$22 to \$46; in Germany, from \$69 to \$114. In the United States, about one-sixth of the total income of the people is swallowed up in taxes. The working-girl whose weekly pittance is \$12, pays \$2 for the benefits of government; the young father of a family, struggling to make ends meet on \$1,200 per year, pays, in the higher cost of living if not through more direct channels, \$200 to the government.

Does war pay? It certainly does not seem to have paid either the victors or the vanquished in prostrate Europe. And if the war brought nothing but new sufferings to all the nations engaged it, again, it may be asked, who won the war?

#### Good Government and the Ku Klux Klan

RETURNING to his capital, after a hasty visit to Washington, the Governor of Louisiana left the stage free for the entrance of rumor, painted full of tongues. The Governor, said some, was greatly disturbed because the President had appointed to a Federal office in New Orleans a gentleman of color. Others alleged, and with some show of reason, that the Governor had repaired to Washington to tell the President how the machinations of the Ku Klux Klan had destroyed the republican form of government in Louisiana. A third rumor had it that this much-advertised visit was only the first step in a political plot to remove a number of State officials. None of these rumors seems to be true. In a formal statement, the Governor, after disclaiming any wish to "play politics," denies that peace and good order are at an end in his State. He intimates, however, that they are seriously

threatened, and he is certain that unless the good citizens of the State unite to prosecute the Klan under the law, the days of republican government in Louisiana are at an end.

Unfortunately for the country at large, the views of Governor Parker are not universally accepted. Oregon is about to inaugurate a governor who owes his place largely, if not entirely, to an appeal to the Klan. In several other States, city and county officials have been elected, not because they were qualified for public service, but because they were able to show that they hated the Catholic Church. The increasing number of such officials is calculated to alarm those old-fashioned Americans who believe that it is poor political policy to proscribe a candidate for office because he is a Jew or a Catholic, or because his ancestors,

instead of practising piracy under the English flag, indulged in cannibalism along Afric's sunny strand.

Fundamentally, of course, the principles and practises of the Klan are incompatible with good government. They are simply usurpation, and usurpation always ends in tyranny. While the alleged object of attack is the Catholic Church, it is the American form of government, not the Church, which in the end will suffer. Seventy years ago in more than one city, the streets ran red with the blood of Catholics. If not proscribed by public opinion and rigorously prosecuted for its misdeeds by the responsible authorities, the Klan will bring about similar excesses. Misguided non-Catholics will do well to heed the signs of the times.

## Dramatics

### The Season's Plays

IN the matter of the merit and the appeal of plays there may be as many opinions as there are productions. Granting this fact, and who will dispute it?, we must also admit the variations in the attitude of theater-goers toward theatrical attractions. There is a class, a very large one, which patronizes the theater solely for entertainment. There is a class, unfortunately much smaller, which demands more than this, art and beauty and an appeal to mind and soul. There is a class, fortunately small, whose sole interest is in salacious plays, and a class, fortunately larger in this country than in any other, which demands that the plays it attends shall be clean. To all these tastes New York theatrical producers cater in their various fashions, and the productions they have made this year fall as usual under headings of worth while, or merely entertaining, or salacious, or innocuous, as the case may be.

To the readers of AMERICA, the special dramatic appeal of the season may lie in two of the worth-while productions, the "Hamlet" of Mr. John Barrymore, and Galsworthy's "Loyalties." There are, of course, differences of viewpoint as to details of Barrymore's "Hamlet," but there is no question that he is giving us something beautiful and, incredibly, something a little different from any "Hamlet" we have seen before. He is a simple Dane, very young, but very human, who reads his lines almost colloquially, as if he really were speaking to those around him. Incidentally, he reads them in the midst of the most impressive silence the New York theater has known for a long time. There is not a rustle, there is hardly the indrawing of a breath, during the soliloquies.

Galsworthy's "Loyalties" is an up-to-date social study of the kind he loves to give us, and, as is usual with him, he leaves the solution of his problem in the air and lets us form our own conclusions. His plot is simple. A Jew who is not a gentleman, but whose great wealth has won him an uncertain footing in the society of gentlemen, has a thousand pounds stolen from him while he is a guest in

an English country house. The thief is a fellow guest, an English gentleman. All the other guests are English gentlemen and gentlewomen. For one reason or another, through loyalty to their class, they combine against the Jew to protect the culprit and to defeat justice. In the end the Jew wins, but he has been such a cad from start to finish that the sympathy of the audience, like that of his fellow guests, is against him. Mr. Galsworthy would have done better to make his Jew more appealing. There are Jews who are gentlemen, and the playwright tries to throw an occasional sop to them by having his characters mention the fact. On the whole, however, his brief is against the Jews, who, seemingly undisturbed by the fact, nightly add themselves to the big audiences that watch his tense and dramatic play.

Among the other dramas for which the worth-while claim is made should be mentioned the Theater Guild success, "R. U. R.," by Karel Capek, Mr. Brady's much heralded "insect play" by the same author, and Channing Pollock's religious drama, "The Fool." "The Fool" is a young clergyman who tries to live his life as Christ would now live it if He came among us. He resigns from his fashionable church, loses the girl he loves because she is not in sympathy with his ideals, gives away his private fortune, and devotes himself to an effort to uplift the city's waifs and strays. They turn against him; they almost destroy him. But in the end the play leaves him free to continue his work and to gaze up at the stars, obviously Mr. Pollock's conception of the only earthly reward such a worker can expect. "The Fool" is seriously presented and seriously received. There are occasional holes in the construction through which the spectators drop. But the playwright cheerfully picks them up again and they go home reflecting that the play has a great theme.

"The World We Live In," in which the lives of insects are supposed to typify our own and the futility of mere human effort, is one of those novelties the habitual playgoer feels that he must not miss. He wants to say he has seen it. Also he is struck by the frankness of the lines



and by the orgies of life and love and death shown in the mimic insect world. At times, as in the too-frank butterfly scene, and during the wonderful battle of the ants, he is intensely interested. The remainder of the evening he yawns behind his program and sagely reflects that it must have cost Brady a lot of money to put the play on.

"R. U. R." is also a novelty, written around the familiar Frankenstein theme, but with genuine power and appeal in its working out. The period of the play is the indefinite future in which a group of scientists invent and manufacture a race of mechanical men and women, strong, efficient, living things of high intelligence, but with no sensibilities, appetites or passions. They cost one hundred and fifty dollars each, they live twenty years, and their excuse for existence is that they do the drudgery of the world, leaving real men and women free to become supermen and superwomen. The manufacture of the Robots, they are called "Rossum's Universal Robots," after their inventor, and R. U. R. for short, increases till there are a thousand of them to every real man. They are bought by various governments to carry on the business of war. Eventually they rise against their makers and destroy man taking over themselves the running of the world. But the secret of their manufacture has also been destroyed and, as they cannot reproduce themselves, they know that in twenty years the last of them will be dead and the earth depopulated. Against the grim background of this *impasse* the author gives us, in the last few moments of his play, the suggestion of a dawning soul in two of them, a man and a woman, the finest of them all, who, drawn together by an attraction no Robot has experienced before, feel in themselves the first stirrings of the instincts of protection, self-sacrifice and love.

Among the best of the merely entertaining plays, of which we have a surfeit this year, as always, is one by that delicate and whimsical artist, A. A. Milne. Of almost any play by Mr. Milne we may be sure that it will be clean, charmingly written and admirably acted. It may not have a "purpose." The chances are that it will not. And even if it has, Mr. Milne may mislay it during the course of the drama, which is rather refreshing in these days when so many playwrights worry their "purposes" as dogs worry bones. Milne's average play will be amusing, it will be fairly logical, and it may have moments that are Barrie-like in their elfish charm. All these typical characteristics appear in his play "The Romantic Age," now on the New York stage. As much cannot be said for "The Lucky One," which the Theater Guild has so unexpectedly miscast.

Near the head of the list of clean and entertaining plays one might put "The Torch Bearers." It is pure comedy, but it is as rollicking as a farce. Anyone who at any time has taken part in private theatricals—and who has not?—will recognize the fidelity of this showing of the amateur dramatic club and the humor of its rehearsal and its public

performance. In the last act the playwright suddenly decides that he must give the audience a thought to carry home, and the result is rather heavy. But the first two acts are wholly refreshing.

"Merton of the Movies" is another nice bit of comedy, with its revelation of the inner workings of the moving picture industry, which the author, Harry Leon Wilson, has studied in its habitat on the Pacific coast. "Shore Leave," Frances Starr's successful play, is amusing, unobjectionable in theme and treatment, and, of course, admirably produced and acted. "Partners Again" is merely more or less amusing dialogue, whatever its following may claim for it. "Thin Ice" and "So This is London" will please the tired business man. "Hospitality," the latest offering of the Equity League, is distinctly heavy. The failure of this band of artists to produce anything worth while is one of the disappointments of the theatrical season, but they may surprise us yet. Of the melodramas the best, of course, is "Whispering Wires" which gives its audience the required thrills, but does not approach "The Bat" in construction and interpretation.

Among the plays the clean-minded amusement seeker will cross from the list are various translations and adaptations of European scripts which are now on our boards. Several of these are admirably acted, notably "Rose Bernd," the somber Hauptmann play to which Miss Ethel Barrymore is mistakenly lending her beautiful art, and "The Love Child," whose philosophy is so incomprehensible to Americans. These, and "The Awful Truth," and "To Love," and a half a dozen others, are plays for the young to avoid. Even the most sophisticated theatergoer, who casts off their influence lightly, finds that they leave an unpleasant taste in the mouth. Mr. Somerset Maugham, an English author obsessed by the French school, is represented by two plays of careful workmanship and unpleasant theme—"Rain," adapted by others from his novel, "Miss Thompson," and his own drama, "East of Suez," both of which obviously appeal to his special following.

And all this time, murmurs a reader, not one word about the "Chauve Souris"! The explanation is that it is not wise to mention the "Chauve Souris" at the beginning of a summary of theatrical attractions. One might end by giving it all the space! For it is difficult to be restrained in one's tribute to these Russian players who transport us to the very heart of their country and give us a breathtaking evening of absolute novelty and beauty and art. If the stranger in New York has only one night for the theatre, he should go to see the Russians.

ELIZABETH JORDAN.

#### GOD'S WAY

God hath a peculiar art  
Of having Beauty dwell apart!

Only the eagle is allowed  
To gaze beyond the utmost cloud.

Angels alone have seen thus far  
The splendor of the farthest star.

And none but God has heard the hymn  
And minstrelsy of Cherubim.

She whose fair flesh awoke from death  
Was hid away in Nazareth.

And He Who said, "Let there be light!"  
Was born upon a winter's night.

God hath a peculiar art  
Of having Beauty dwell apart!

WILLIAM F. McDONALD, S. J.

### REVIEWS

**The Adventurers.** By MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilmer & Co.

Dr. Egan after specially pleasing his international clientele of grown-ups with the "Confessions of a Book-Lover" turns to the little folks and in "The Adventurers" provides them with several delightful hours. As in all correct fairy tales there is an ogre who appears during the trans-Atlantic voyage and torments the hero of the story, Bernard, a French war-orphan, until the properly happy ending. Captious critics might express some surprise that so experienced a diplomat as Dr. Egan lands his little hero in New York with supreme disregard for the immigration laws "in such cases made and provided." But no doubt he remembers that famous axiom of statecraft, "What's the Constitution between friends?" Certainly Ellis Island red tape must not be permitted to tangle up a good story for good little boys and girls like the Doctor's seven grandchildren to whom this book is affectionately dedicated.

T. F. M.

**The Business of Writing.** By ROBERT CORTES HOLLIDAY and ALEXANDER VAN RENSSELAER. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$2.00.

This is a practical book showing the practical side of writing. For aspiring authors it will prove a good guide. For teachers of English it will be helpful and for all who are interested in modern literature there is much information contained in these pages. The very interesting papers by Holliday that ran for some time in the *Bookman* are reprinted here and Van Rensselaer has added some of his own. The idea of the book is to give a view of what goes on in editorial offices and to destroy false notions of the business of authorship. It does not attempt to encourage writing, to give any get-rich-quick method of authorship. It states very plainly the process through which manuscripts must go before they are accepted for publication, explains the very interesting function of the literary agent, and tries to make clear the relationship between editor and contributor. A good index and bibliography complete a very interesting book.

G. C. T.

**Life of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.** By ALLEN SINCLAIR WILL, Litt.D., LL.D. New York: Dutton. \$10.00.

In 1911 the author of this biography published an interesting account of life and labors of the great American Cardinal. But the last ten years of that career, fruitful years of labors and conspicuous achievements, were necessarily left untouched. These are now faithfully chronicled. Some parts of the former volume have been embodied in the one thousand pages of the new work. But the author thoroughly remodeled his first account, added to it many new details, and presents us now with a fully developed portrait. The personal side of the life of James Gibbons has been lovingly sketched. Every American knew the American Cardinal's interest in America and her accomplishments, his thoroughly American

ideals, his absolute identification with all that they stand for. They did not know perhaps of the simplicity, humor and cheeriness, the tenderness that radiated from him in private life, and made him so lovable, so optimistic and so buoyant. They will read then with more than usual interest such chapters as "Personality and Private Life," "Social Habits—Friendships," "Anecdotes and Incidents," "Literary Tastes and Labors," "Elements of Greatness," "Gifts as a Leader."

A life of Cardinal Gibbons is a history of our times. He played a prominent, at times a splendid part in the religious, social and educational movements that were shaping themselves around him. Mr. Will does not pretend to give us a philosophical study of the principles and causes of these events, but everywhere he has faithfully written a clear, simple and accurate chronicle of the outstanding facts in the life of the beloved American Cardinal. The book throws a clear light on the last years of the Archbishop of Baltimore. Historians of the future will find it a treasure house of faithfully recorded and interesting facts. It is well printed and illustrated, and there is a very good index.

J. C. R.

**Dominus Vobiscum.** By the Rt. Rev. FRANCIS C. KELLEY, D.D., LL.D. Chicago: Matre & Co. \$1.50.

**Prophets of the Better Hope.** By the Rev. WILLIAM J. KERBY, Ph.D., LL.D., New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$2.00.

Of these two books, intended for clerical readers, the first is written as a series of letters addressed by his former pastor to a seminarian who is about to be admitted to the priesthood. It is a book for priests as well as seminarians, and both will draw from it instruction and inspiration. The high aims constantly to be kept in view, in private and in public life, are attractively set before the reader. The author asks for nothing that is not attainable by the soul chosen out of many and set aside for the greatest service to which any human being can aspire, yet neither does he fail to point out the perfection which should be attained by the priest and which the laity may rightly expect of their spiritual guide.

Like Mgr. Kelley so Dr. Kerby of the Catholic University of Washington faithfully holds up to his readers the mirror of the priestly life. The two books fitly complement each other. They are at one in the great purpose they pursue and the ideals they set forth. But while Mgr. Kelley presents in concrete form his priestly model, Dr. Kerby analyzes with keen discrimination the life of the Catholic clergy as it has come under his constant observation. By the same analytic methods he discusses the qualities that should be found in the perfect minister of God's mercies to men. He is never cutting or sarcastic, but exemplifies in his own character, as it shines through his work, that happy complex which Mgr. Kelley so well describes as "the priest-gentleman." No priest can read either of these two volumes without being the better for the leisure thus spent.

J. H.

**The Way of Poetry** An Anthology for Younger Readers. By JOHN DRINKWATER. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.00.

Mr. Drinkwater in issuing an anthology for younger readers shows an optimism seldom found at his time of life. In the first place, anthologies are never a success because they imply a selection of the best and the only reader quite satisfied is the compiler himself. Promise a man a funny story and he listens with benevolence. Tell him you know the three funniest that ever were told and you have a debate on your hands. In the present case someone is sure to complain that space has been used for some very mature and thoughtful poems which could easily have been filled with the smiles of real youth, even though it meant the invasion of this sacred ground by mere Americans like Eugene Field and James Whitcomb Riley. But this brings us to the second great difficulty facing this particular anthologist. Just how young are these "younger readers" whom he has chosen for his public? If they



are so young that they will consent to read books published for the young, they are too young to grasp anything in this book but the nursery rhymes. Mr. Drinkwater's salvation lies in the fact that there are so many of us careworn readers "young by choice" who can read Blake and Herrick with nostrils full of the early Spring, who can revel in "Little Trotty Wagtail" and "Nicholas Nye" without losing the savour of such things as "The Donkey," by G. K. Chesterton which concludes with the following lines:

The tattered outlaw of the earth  
Of ancient crooked will  
Starve, scourge, deride me: I am dumb,  
I keep my secret still.

Fools! For I also had my hour  
One far, fierce hour and sweet.

There was a shout about my ears  
And palms about before my feet.

A dainty book this is and many will enjoy it for "the child never dies in us all."  
R. A. G.

**The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page.** By BURTON J. HENDRICK. Two Volumes. New York: Doubleday Page & Co. \$10.00.

Walter Page died at the end of the war, as much of a casualty as his nephew who died on the field of battle. Mr. Page spent himself in the service of his country for five years as ambassador to England. His work was constant and unceasing, taxing his full strength until a complete collapse came. His life ended a few months after the armistice. It was a full life too, and its most interesting part, of course, was his ambassadorial career. While officially neutral during the time that preceded America's entrance into the war, he was always a British sympathizer. Anglo-Saxonism was his cult. He scorned the idea of toadying to the British Lion, and he scorned the idea of twisting the Lion's tail. Britain and America together could determine the peace of the world, with America leading and teaching Britain. This is the constantly recurring theme in letter after letter. America alone understood true democracy. Britain did not, and it was for America to teach democracy's lesson to Britain and thus to the rest of the world. This was Page's philosophy of life. If he had any religion it was this. For anything like the supernatural was far from his mind. He might be dubbed a great Anglo-American humanitarian.

Whatever may be thought of his philosophy, his letters may be considered as a valuable contribution to war history. From their contents it is evident that bankruptcy not an armistice would have been England's lot had not America intervened. In July, 1917, Page wrote:

The whole allied combination on this side of the ocean are very much nearer the end of their financial resources than anybody has guessed or imagined. We only can save them. . . . The submarines are steadily winning the war. Pershing and his army have bucked up the French for the moment. But for his coming there was more or less danger of a revolution in Paris and of serious defection in the army.

The real tragedy was financial when the Balfour mission came to Washington. By April, 1917, Great Britain had overdrawn her account with J. P. Morgan to the extent of \$400,000,000, and had no cash available with which to meet this overdraft. "Though at first there was a slight misunderstanding about this matter the American government finally paid this overdraft out of the proceeds of the First Liberty Loan. This act saved the credit of the allied countries." And Burton Hendrick remarks it was the joint product of Page's work in London and that of the Balfour Commission in the United States.

Wilson's relationship with Page, and Page's frank estimate of his chief and the Washington government are all set down in the letters contained in these volumes. No doubt is left in the read-

er's mind as to the preeminence of the position of Colonel House in the Wilson administration. He and Wilson were the administration. Of House, Page wrote to Sir Edward Grey in 1913:

He is a private citizen, a man without personal political ambition, a modest, quiet, even shy fellow. He helps to make Cabinets, to shape policies, to select judges and ambassadors and such like, merely for the pleasure of seeing that these tasks are well done.

The anomalous position of such a citizen in a democracy, Walter Page does not explain in any of his letters or journals. G. C. T.

**Handbook of Canon Law.** For Congregations of Women Under Simple Vows. By the Rev. D. I. LANSLOTS, O.S.B. New York: Fred. Pustet Co.

**A Commentary on Canon Law.** Volume VIII. By the Rev. P. CHARLES AUGUSTINE, O.S.B., D.D. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co.

**Commentarium in Codicem Iuris Canonici.** Liber II. Auctore Guido Cocchi, Con. Miss. Taurinorum Augustae: Petrus Marietti.

With the issuance of the new Code of Canon Law, on Pentecost, 1918, there was an immediate need of readjustment in all the commentaries on this subject. Accordingly, Catholic scholars specializing in canon law, proceeded at once to the task and now we are beginning to enjoy the printed fruits of their labors. Father Lanslots' book appears in its tenth edition "revised and enlarged to conform with the new Code of Canon Law." The purpose of this excellent and scholarly manual is well expressed in the closing paragraph of the Preface:

As the laws of the church are made to be observed, religious should know them. The non-fulfilment of the law on the part of Superiors as well as of inferiors would be inexcusable when culpable ignorance is the cause of transgression. All should be properly informed of their respective duties. A "Handbook," therefore, such as this, should be at the command of every member.

The learned Benedictine writer of "A Commentary on Canon Law" opens his eighth volume with a short but pithy introduction on criminology since this book treats of the "Penal Code" of the new canon law. As in his other volumes so here he appends a running interpretation and commentary to each and every section. Part I wherein are treated the general principles, is very interesting and takes into account recent findings of epileptic, neurasthenic and psychopathic states as bearing on responsibility. The volume closes with a very complete index to the eight volumes.

Father Cocchi's book is a resume of his lectures in the seminary of Brignole-Sale. It covers the assigned matter thoroughly, and offers an attractive page to the eye. Every mechanical help is used to aid the pupil to make the proper accentuation of important over unimportant points.

F. P. LEB.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Negro Folk-Speech.**—"The Black Border" (State Company, Columbia, S. C.), by Ambrose E. Gonzales, is a collection of Negro stories from the coastal territory of South Carolina where "the Gullah speech still persists in its original 'purity.'" To one who knows the Negro well, this book will afford pleasant reading. Moreover, it is most interesting philologically as a written record of a puzzling folk-speech. Just how these isolated Negroes have reshaped our language may be exemplified by a sentence from "Old Pickett":

Mas' Rafe, uh bin ketch cootuh een me time, uh bin ketch alligetuh, but uh yent fuh ketch no t'unduh en' no lightin', en' da' t'ing oonuh call Ole Pickett, him duh t'unduh en light-nin' alltwo one time!

All of which is clear to one who understands these simple folk.

**Teachers of Boys.**—"Zeal in the Class Room" (St. Michael's College, Toronto), by the Rev. M. V. Kelly, C.S.B., is a stimulating little pastoral theology which would interest any religious

engaged in teaching boys. It comprises thirty-three short essays on such suggestive topics as: "What Boys Should Go to College," "Daily Mass," "Sodality," "Mortification," "Natural Virtues" and a few on the training of the teacher himself. Though the author has spent his life in a preparatory seminary type of boarding school, yet if we make allowances for difference of viewpoint, difference in the class of boys and in the training of the faculty, there is much which can furnish food for thought in Father Kelly's book for teachers in an ordinary boarding school.

**Poetry for Youth.**—Gertrude Slaughter in "Shakespeare and the Heart of the Child" (Macmillan, \$2.00), has found an easy and original way of introducing the young folk to the great dramatist. The child's innate sense of the dramatic and romantic has been admirably seized.—Grace Rhys in the preface to "The Children's Garland of Verse" (Dutton, \$3.00), tells us of poems learned in childhood, "They will sing to us when we are sad, and dance in our memories when we are merry." Excellently true, and that is why she should have left out Mr. Clough's "What They Think" from her splendid collection.—Another anthology is Sara Teasdale's "Rainbow of Gold" (Macmillan, \$2.00), a collection of about eighty standard classical poems of the type of Lanier's "Song of the Chattahoochee" and Burn's "To a Mouse." Dugald Walker supplies artistic illustrations for this, as Charles Robinson does for the former book.

**Girls' Books.**—"Including Mother" (Macmillan, \$1.50), by Margaret Ashmun, is a tale of a temperamental mother and her two sensible daughters. It deals with life in a small town and is a well-written narrative of very real characters. It will prove of special interest to young girl readers.—"Captain Lucy and Lieutenant Bob," "Captain Lucy in France," "Captain Lucy in the Home Sector," "Captain Lucy's Flying Ace" (Penn Publishing Company, \$1.75 each), are four stories of the Army Girl Series by Aline Havard, written for girls of high school age. Army life is well described in these stories, and the reader is made familiar with the scenes that took place at army posts, in camps and in the field during the late war.

**Liberalism.**—Whatever comes from Cardinal Billot is at once orthodox and interesting, and so his theses on Liberalism translated by Rev. G. B. O'Toole, Ph.D., S.T.D., professor of theology at St. Vincent Seminary, Beatty, Pa., will be sincerely welcomed by all who love the truth and wish to see their fellowmen guided by right ideals. In these days of loose thinking and wild as well as wide humanitarianism it is imperative to have the search-light of truth turned on modern catchwords and mouthings. This is what Cardinal Billot does in this book and this is what Father O'Toole also does in the remarks which serve as an introduction to his translation.

**"Make Me a Child Again."**—Mrs. M. C. Potter must be quite a story-teller for her book, "The Pinafore Pocket Story Book" (Dutton, \$2.50), is filled with charming "teeny weeny" tales which will delight all children as they did her own. Miss Balcom's pictures are very good.—Back to our childhood days we swiftly passed as we picked up "Chatterbox—1923" (Page). It is the same chatty book it always was and its prints are as quaint as ever.—One feels rather queer when reading "Rootabaga Stories" (Harcourt), by Carl Sandburg, for they contain that queerest kind of nonsense most pleasing to the vagrant fancies of a child. The Misses Petersham have helped the merry dance on by their pictures.—Did you ever read a life of Santa Claus? Well, Sarah Addington tells it cleverly in "The Boy Who Lived in Pudding

Lane" (Atlantic, \$2.50), and dear old Santa is well drawn by Gertrude A. Kay.—In "East of the Sun and West of the Moon" (Doran, \$3.50), children who love adventure will find eerie and thrilling stories from the folk-lore of the North and they will be bewitched by the wonderland artistry of Kay Nielsen.—"Sing a Song of Sleepy Head" (Dutton, \$2.00), by J. W. Foley, contains a pleasant play staged in the enchanted land of dreams, wherein Captain Kidd and Bluebeard and Miss Muffet, etc., etc., take part. The second part of the book tells of the dream adventures of Isabel and ends with "The Flight of the Stick Candy Man."—Not only youngsters but older folk will relish "Once Upon a Time," by A. A. Milne (Putnam), and all the adventures of good King Merriwig of Euralia what time he warred upon the seven-leagued-booted King of Barodia.—"The Adventures of Maya the Bee" (Seltzer, \$3.00), by Waldemar Bonsels, is the story of a bee who leaves its hive and tries to see the world by and for itself. The book is very interesting and contains some exquisite descriptions of nature. There is an uncalled use of the name of God in exclamations and a few unnecessary vulgarities are introduced.

**Novels.**—"Quest" (Macmillan), by Helen Hull is a piece of psychology with an air of reality, which may prove attractive to those interested in the soul development of girls. The domain of faith and its abiding peace is never dreamt of by Jean and so her quest for happiness through peace, so long thwarted, is narrowed as the book closes into a search for "love, work, myself." Thus the book leaves Jean where it found her, searching still and forever doomed to search.

"Polly the Pagan" (Page), by Isabel L. Anderson is a love story in which an American in the diplomatic service vies with a Russian prince for the hand of an American girl. The prince, the American and Polly tell their love and their adventures in a series of letters.

"Rolling Acres" (Small Maynard), by Bessie R. Hoover will appeal to readers who like a quiet novel. It is a very good picture of a rural community and its interests.

"Christmas Outside of Eden" (Dodd), by Coningsby Dawson is a Christmas fantasy that one searches in vain to find an excuse for. The book is certainly not for children and no grown up would read it a second time. The story at times touches on the blasphemous, and frequently it crosses the line of the absurd and the scoffing.

"Two Shall Be Born" (Century, \$1.90), by Marie Conway Oemler, tells the story of a New York traffic policeman and a Polish heroine. The plot is thrilling but melodramatic and improbable. Count Zuleski, the supposed Polish patriot and father of the heroine, is a distorted figure, a supra-nationalist in whom the father is submerged in the conspirator, who exposes his daughter to frightful dangers.

"Penelope's Problems" (Page), by Dorothea Castlehun flows along with that naive and engaging simplicity of style and action only attempted by writers of juvenile fiction. The characters all seem to have but one attribute apiece. We rather suspect Dorothea Castlehun of personifying; for instance: Mrs. Forrester, Motherly Sweetness; Aunt Emily, Spinsterly Acidity; Avelyn, Spite Rampant; Pen herself, a Loving, Lovable Soul. It is a book in which the author leaves little thinking to be done by the reader; hence we look for its increasing popularity.

"Laughter Limited" (Doran, \$1.75), by Nina Wilcox Putnam is a very amusing and interesting story of Hollywood life with not a dull or unclean page from beginning to end. With the single exception of Mr. Wilson's "Merton of the Movies" it is easily the best motion picture novel of the last few years, shorn too of any propagandism. The heroine's English however is poor at times and the Ring Lardner language scarcely fits her character.



## Education

### Religious Training in Schools

**I**T is certain that man cannot get along successfully without God, and without a knowledge and appreciation of what he owes to his Creator. It is equally certain that that knowledge must be implanted within him in the days of his childhood, when his character is being molded. The greatest influence in this development of character, next to the home, is the school, and so we come to the conclusion that, if religion, the study of the Creator, is ever of paramount importance to the creature, it is during his school years, when he is shaped into what he will continue to be throughout his life.

Long ago, John Locke, in his "Thoughts Concerning Education," laid stress upon the need of the religious element in the education of a "young gentleman."

I place virtue, as the first and most necessary of those endowments that belong to a man or a gentleman; as absolutely requisite to make him valued and beloved by others, acceptable or tolerable to himself. Without that, I think, he will be happy neither in this nor the other world. As the foundation of this, there ought very early to be imprinted on his mind a true notion of God, as of the independent Supreme Being, Author and Maker of all things, from whom we receive all our good, who loves us, and gives us all things. And consequent to this, instill into him a love and reverence of this Supreme Being.

Benjamin Rush, one of the Pennsylvania signers of the Declaration of Independence, says in a similar strain, in an address on "Education for Patriotism":

I proceed in the next place to inquire, what mode of education we shall adopt so as to secure to the State all the advantages that are to be derived from the proper instruction of youth, and here I beg leave to remark, that the only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in religion. Without this, there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all Republican governments.

And now the educators of our day are beginning to awaken to the fact that God is still necessary to the world. All mention of Him Who said, "Suffer little children to come unto Me," has been carefully kept out of the curricula of education planned for the youth of our land, and we are beginning to discover that there is something wanting without Him. President-Emeritus Eliot of Harvard, in a recent address on education, blamed the falling off of attendance in the Protestant churches upon the lack of religious education.

Most of our children [he says] go out into the world without having received in their schools any knowledge of religion. . . . It is now maintained (as a natural consequence) that the actual majority of the men, women and children in the United States are unchurched, never go to church, know nothing about church.

In Pennsylvania, the Allegheny County Sabbath School Association, through the courtesy of the Board of Public Education, presented questionnaires in the public schools of the county during the closing days of the last school term, in order to determine how many children were regular attendants in some religious school, whether Protestant

or Catholic or Jewish. The committee of the Board of Public Education, in granting the permission to distribute the questionnaires, said:

The board recognizes the constitutional provision guaranteeing to each American the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. It has also fully observed the time-honored custom of preventing the introduction of any form of sectarian activity in the schools. It believes, however, that all the churches and all the schools should be united in favor of character development and moral instruction.

Out of 77,500 questionnaires distributed, 73,211 answers were received, and President English of the Sabbath School Association reports:

From the replies received we believe that there are more than 30,000 children of the public schools who do not attend Sunday school, and some of those who are acquainted with the Morals Court believe that there are fully 50,000 children in the city who do not attend Sunday school, church, mission or synagogue.

This in a city of some 500,000 population!

As a direct result of this finding, a "Twentieth Century Children's Crusade," lasting from November 5 to November 19, with representatives from all the Protestant sects, as well as Catholic and Jewish delegates, was undertaken to bring the necessity of the knowledge of God home to those who are without the light. Some time will elapse before any definite results can be accomplished, but the outcome of this worthy endeavor will be watched with interest. The question of religious instruction was also up for discussion at the recent meeting of the Westmoreland County Synod of the Presbyterian church. One of the delegates told of the cooperation existing between Catholics and Protestants in New Brighton, Pennsylvania, where the 150 Catholic children in the public schools were dismissed each Friday afternoon in order that they might attend their own school of religious instruction. And the Rev. Evert Leon Jones of Philadelphia, explaining the work of the "Three Hour a Week Church School," said: "The matter of religious instruction is the basic thing in the church; the problem of religious education must be solved before most of the remedies for modern ills may be applied."

A recent newspaper account tells how 300 girls at the National Kindergarten and Elementary College in Chicago were asked to think back "to the days in pinafores when they curled up of an afternoon and lost themselves in childhood's heroes" and to name the heroes they felt they could safely recommend to mothers and teachers of the country as eligible for a Childhood's Hall of Fame. The result of the balloting shows Christ in first place, but by a margin of less than one per cent over Lincoln, while Washington stands a close third. David, Daniel, Joseph also are chosen for positions of honor, while Moses manages to tie with Mother Goose for eleventh place. Surely it proves that faith in the Divinity of our Lord is well nigh gone.

The interest that is being aroused in the need of religious training for the youth of our country is a good sign in-

deed, but where it will lead, what solution will be adopted, it is difficult to guess. And it is hard to say whether any solution short of the introduction of religious instruction in all schools will prove of any value. But what brand of religious instruction can be introduced that will safeguard the freedom in faith that is guaranteed to all citizens in the Constitution of our land? Dr. Eliot, after he had deplored the dearth of religion in our schools, could find no better remedy to offer than an indefinite moral system which will give offense to no one, Christian, Chinese, Buddhist or Hindu.

At any rate, we Catholics are free from all cause for worry. The burden of additional taxation which the maintenance of our own school system imposes upon us may at times seem unjust and hard to bear, but at least it gives us the consciousness that we are following the earnest exhortation of our Saviour, that no earthly possession, however precious it might be, should be accepted as a barter for our immortal souls.

ANTHONY M. BENEDIK.

## Sociology

### A Page from the November Elections

**L**ABOR is exultant over its newly-proved voting strength. For weeks before the recent elections, its national and local press waged a vigorous attack on certain candidates, while it canonized others as friends of the working man. Telling details were meticulously enumerated. In the case of one office-seeker, his picture with a scratch across it was inserted as an advertisement in the labor papers of his district. Underneath the caricature was the statement that this person had engaged irresponsible strike-breakers; that they had killed an innocent striker, and that the advertisement was being paid for by the widow and children of the murdered man. This surely was the climax-appeal to the feelings of workingmen.

Other striking tactics used in a well planned campaign were the ignoring of all party distinctions. There will always be a certain element of dyed-in-the-wool Democrats and Republicans. An independent vote thrown to a candidate on either ticket will, then, be a deciding factor in any election. Moreover, the policies of both the old parties are so platitudinous towards the workingman as to merit being ignored. It is senile to class a man as a friend or an enemy of labor merely because he styles himself Democrat or Republican. It is necessary to have an *auto da fe* in each case. Essentially this consists in favorable deeds done for the laborer. Theoretically, this axiom has always been held as indisputable; in practice, too, the truth seems now to be thoroughly understood by the worker. It was but two years ago, for instance, that one, high in labor circles almost from the beginning of the present Federation movement, urged his followers to vote for a certain presidential candidate because the party thus to be rewarded had done much for the laborer. However,

other motives were more compelling and the reply of the counted ballots was a landslide for the opposing ticket. Labor refused to be coerced even by its own leader.

If the 1920 elections were an indication of labor's independence at the polls, the 1922 electoral results point to the conscious power of united and well-informed workmen. Certainly this much is true, that successful candidates in New York, Iowa, Kansas, Wisconsin, to mention most obvious instances, received the substantial approbation of labor. Here is a further proof of the wisdom that has consistently refused, despite strong urging to the contrary, to isolate the workingman into an individual political organization. The strongest weapon of a compact minority is always in the possibility of a balance of power. Even then it may taste defeat. This was apparently the case in Ohio, where the question of light wines and beer was printed on the November ballots. To judge from the propaganda of the labor papers in behalf of the measure and their number of advertisements urging this vindication of personal liberty, the "balance of power" theory should have easily secured the passage of the amendment. Nevertheless, in the final tabulation there was a 170,000 majority in favor of Volsteadism. However, if it is insisted with economic students that Prohibition is an uncanny movement to analyze, and as, moreover, labor was a successful factor in the anti-Prohibition victories in Illinois, New York and New Jersey, the Ohio case should not be unduly stressed. Without it as an example, the limitations on the "balance of power" theory are sufficiently evident. Nor will labor become so giddy with success as to think it has unconquerable strength. The point rather is that it possesses a force that cannot be contemned with impunity.

This power would become the greater in the event of the formation of a third great party, such as was Roosevelt's Progressives. To discuss the likelihood that such a new national political movement will take place, is, of course, beyond the scope of this paper. Yet the atmosphere of the 1922 ballot is not unlike that of 1911 and 1912. Certainly the breaking away from voting a "straight" ticket has become an accomplished fact. Senator Reed of Missouri retains his place because he was Senator Reed and not because he was a Democrat. In Ohio, a Democratic Governor and a Republican Senator were created by the strokes of the same pencils. Widespread disgust with the old parties and a lack of confidence in the sincerity of both may crystallize into the birth of a new organization. In such an eventuality, then, our question is, will labor remain a neutral, bargaining with its balance of power for the recognition of its rights from all the candidates? Or will it, in its eagerness to obtain justice for all, throw itself into the formation of such a new party, and into the molding of its principles? The latter course would be the more altruistic, though perhaps not the more worldly-wise.

But aside from the possibility of a third party, why



should labor not champion just causes other than its own? Righteousness makes all principles akin. A bigot on one point may soon become rabid on another. Even from the viewpoint of utility, the workingman will find that it pays in the long run to vote down prejudice wherever it exists. Concrete proofs are to be had without wandering very far afield. In the recent election, a candidate made bold to ask support from union-men. The plea advanced was the Ku Klux Americanism of the candidate. On investigation into that worthy's views on labor, it was found that the Klan's patriotism is compatible with opposition to the closed shop and other principles that the working man holds very dear. In fact, the very secrecy of masked organizations should make them more than suspect to the laborer. The sphinx-like personality of the grinding capitalist, the "private" meetings of interlocking directorates, the sleight-of-hand manipulations of food costs and other ills, due to a lack of public sunlight, have not all these "masked" methods brought untold misery to the poor workingman and his family? Without further evidence, then, should not labor vote against any such law-in-their-own-hands organizations?

The anti-parish-school movement should, we claim, arouse the voting ire of all union men. The system, thus suddenly attacked, has flourished for over a century with practically no legal molestation. Over night it is outlawed at the polls. True, the constitutionality of the act yet awaits the calmly judicial vote of the Supreme Court of the United States. But after all, labor would do well in reflecting that it too in very many places is a minority. Then let it picture the rest of the community strongly organized, let us say, by some anti-labor wave of bigotry. In such a supposition might not the unions or some of their hard earned victories, the closed shop, collective bargaining, the "check-off" system, be similarly outlawed?

Moreover, neglecting the utilitarian viewpoint, these anti-Catholic movements richly deserve the condemnatory suffrage of labor. For the workingman has the chivalry of nature's gentleman and is responsive to the human heart's impulses towards gratitude and admiration. And on whom in reality is this venom of religious bigotry being vented? On the gentle, self-sacrificing teaching Sisterhoods. By implication at least, they are disloyal. Now, these same sweet souls are the human angels of mercy who conduct hospitals, homes for the aged and destitute, asylums for the foundling, the orphan, the fallen. In them the poor have always been welcomed by the prayerful nuns as a brother or sister in Christ.

Finally, labor has never had a more sincere friend than Catholic priests. The names of Leo XIII and Cardinal Gibbons are but two out of thousands. Let the workingman then recall that it is in the parish school that practically all Catholic priests receive their elementary training, and he will have sufficient reason to register his vote against amendments that are prima facie un-American.

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL, S.J.

## Note and Comment

### Prohibition and Statistics

IN the issue of AMERICA for November 4, we printed the detailed statistics furnished by anti-Prohibitionists showing, according to their figures, that in the fifty-six cities selected by them arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct increased 36.21 per cent. To turn the other side of the shield, the following are the diametrically opposite contentions of the Prohibitionists based entirely upon their own statistics. *The Herald and Presbyter*, a Presbyterian paper, says:

One of the benefits of Prohibition is the diminution in crime. This is partially set forth in a tabulated report from twenty-five cities, printed by the World League Against Alcoholism. These cities include Philadelphia, Detroit, Boston, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, San Francisco, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, St. Paul and others. These cities, with a population of 9,432,171, had a total of 1,226,452 arrests for all causes in 1917-18, but 1,089,905 in 1920-21, after Prohibition. There were in the earlier period 408,111 arrests for intoxication, and but 241,118 in the latter year. During the earlier period, in Cincinnati, there were 48,305 arrests for all causes, and but 40,125 in the latter, while for intoxication during the earlier period there were 3,848 and in the latter only 998, or about one-fourth as many. These results have been secured in a time when, following the war, a crime wave has swept the world.

The moral is obvious. It is a strange case when both sides of a disputed question cannot be proved indisputably true by statistics!

### Mrs. Alice Meynell, Catholic Poet, Dies

ON November 27 the news came from London of the death of Mrs. Alice Meynell, essayist and poet, wife of Wilfrid Meynell, the well-known English author and journalist who became a Catholic in 1870. Like her husband, Mrs. Meynell, as well as her parents and sisters, was a convert to the Faith. Alice Meynell's first volume of poems, "Preludes," written in her girlhood, was published in 1876 through the encouragement given her by John Ruskin. These poems were republished with later additions in 1893. Her first essay appeared in the *National Observer* under Mr. Henley. Her listed works include "Poems," "The Rhythm of Life," "The Color of Life," "The Children," "The Spirit of Place," "John Ruskin," "Later Poems," "Ceres Runaway," "Children of the Italian Masters," and "Childhood." Her "Collected Poems" appeared in 1913 and her "Selected Essays" in 1914. She edited English poets for the Red Letter Library and published, in 1907, "The Flowers of the Mind," a choice made by her among the best poets. In 1917 she issued two more volumes, one of poems, "A Father of Women and Other Poems," and the second of essays, "Hearts of Controversy." This long list but partially indicates the range of her literary activities, for she was a frequent contributor to the leading periodicals

of England and the United States. She translated Venturi's "Madonna in Art," and made known to her countrymen one of our own favorite Catholic poets by introducing to English readers, in 1907, selection of poems from Father Tabb. To Wilfrid and Alice Meynell Catholics may be said to be indebted for their great and truly Catholic poet, Francis Thompson. To this he himself bears witness in his "Dedication" of "Poems," where, in offering up his work to Mr. and Mrs. Meynell, he concludes with the acknowledgment: "To you, O dear givers, I give your own giving."

#### Missionary College in Switzerland

**A**FTER the havoc and waste of the war the Church is everywhere active seeking to reconstruct the missions that were made desolate by the call to arms which penetrated even into the farthest corners of pagan lands, into the depths of the jungles and through the heat of burning desert sands, summoning the missionaries to the blood-drenched fields of battle. Others were herded together and shipped into banishment far from their flocks. But the work of reconstruction is proceeding today with wonderful success. This is true even in countries which were the greatest sufferers from the war. Just now a missionary college is to be erected in Switzerland or near the borders of that country, geographically a most strategic point for recruiting vocations as its promoters say:

Any one can see at once the advisability of such a location in these troubled times. It is surely a prodigious work to found a seminary under the present conditions, but the missions cannot wait. Unfortunately we cannot rely much upon Europe in its present deplorable straits. Our hope, therefore, rests on the liberality of America, the more so as the American dollar will accomplish three times as much abroad as here.

Those who may wish to aid this worthy undertaking, which should make possible the development of vocations in Austria and other neighboring countries, can send their contributions to the Rev. Anthony Zehner, M.S., La Salette College, Hartford, Conn.

#### The Modern Propaganda of Self-Extermination

**R**EFERRING to the divorce and eugenist propaganda now actively carried on in the British Empire the *Catholic Herald of India* remarks:

Lord Buckmaster is at present dealing with divorce cases at the rate of one every five minutes; this coupled with a brisk eugenist propaganda by the Health Ministry to empty cradles, and replace Protestant babies by Pomeranian and Chinese poodles, will soon leave the British Empire without any Protestants to run it, as the poodles are obviously unable to do it, eventually to be handed over to Jews and Catholics. As the Jews have such capacity for finance, we shall leave them the banks, and reserve the farms for ourselves. Lord Buckmaster undid forty marriages on July 25, seventy last Thursday and forty last Friday, so that very soon there will be more divorces than marriages, as is the case already in several Protestant States of America. So the work of extermination is going on briskly, and not only is it done more cleanly than in the

days of Queen Mary, but it is done by the Protestants themselves, and they can't complain. All we Catholics have to do is to sit tight and cling to the Ten Commandments, cutting our coat not according to our cloth, but according to the length and breadth of God's Providence, which is the real secret for large families.

One of the best ways in which Catholics can show their faith before the world today is by their practical opposition to the two great evils of our age, divorce and birth control. Let their lives bear witness.

#### Evolutionist Theories on Sacrifice

**N**OT the least interesting information conveyed by the speakers at the recent International Congress of Ethnology held by Catholic scholars at Tilburg, Holland, was the data concerning primitive tribes whose practices and custom are so frequently invoked by the evolutionists as proof of their doctrines. We quote from the article "Catholics and the Study of Religions" in the *Month*:

The notion of sacrifice was examined in its historical manifestations, in its psychological implications, in the literary utterances of India, and in the actual practice of the Kei islanders. The same subject was continued on the following day, when specialists described the ideal and concrete aspects of Sumerian and Hebraic, Arabian and Classical forms of sacrifice. . . . The cumulative effect of these studies was the inevitable conclusion that the evolutionist theories of Tylor and Jevons, Reinach and Durkheim, Wundt and Loisy, are utterly untenable. . . . There was no leaping in the dark, no far-fetched analogies, no sweeping syntheses, none of those statements which are *superbement beaux, absolument faux*.

There are facts; and the facts are that in the very earliest of sacrifices there is an act of homage to the Supreme Giver of life, without destruction or a sacrificial meal. As will be seen, history is not only against the evolutionists, but is a criticism of a theological definition. Professor Wunderle's lecture, "Die Psychologie des Opfers," was hardly less remarkable. His deep psychological penetration reached past prehistoric altar sites to primitive souls, beyond the outward traces of sacrificial rites to the inner spirit of prayer which underlies and accompanies all sacrifice. And if in all this we may have felt some misgivings, reassurance came when Pater Koppers described his own initiation into the religious community of the Fuegians, a people described by Darwin as being devoid of all religion and who in reality, in their sixty-two prayers to Vatauinéuva, reveal a confidence in, a dependence on, an effort at communion with, God which is as remarkable as anything in monotheistic religion. Yet these Yagans, now almost extinct, are a pygmoid people, representing one of the very earliest of the cultural cycles.

Thus Catholic scholarship is again in this most difficult study vindicating its traditional method of patient, objective research, under a host of leaders, most of them priests among whom we may name Baudrillart and Bricont, Bros and Bron, Condamin and Capert, Carnoy and Carra de Vaux, Dahlmann and Dharme, Gräbner and Grandmaison, Habert and Huby, Jonghe and Koppers, Lagrange and Le Roy, Martindale and Menghin, Power and Pinard de la Bouleye, Rousselot and Turchi, Valensin and de la Vallée-Poussin and lastly the outstanding scholar Father Wilhelm Schmidt, S.V.D., who is frankly recognized by Protestants in Europe and America as an Ethnologist *sans pareil*.